

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXIX.

JULY, 1856.

ARTICLE I.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

By Rev. M. Loy, Delaware, Ohio.

THE Holy Catholic Church is an object of faith, not of sight. That which makes her what she is, comes not under the cognizance of our senses: it is spiritually discerned. She is the body of Jesus Christ; yet not his natural body, as it was once seen in its mission of mercy upon the earth, but his body mystical, whose members are not distinguishable as such by human eyes. She is the Holy Temple of God; yet not a tangible temple, as was once the glory of Jerusalem, but a spiritual house built up of lively stones. She is formed and continually pervaded by the life of her Head; and wherever this life, which is conveyed to man by the means of grace, is permitted to abide, there she exists. The entrance of our Savior's life into a human soul, renders the latter a part of the body, by making it a partaker of the life. To be a member of Christ is to be a member of the church, which is Christ, so far as he and his disciples may be, and really are one. 1 Cor. 12: 12; John 17: 21-23. This life is invisible: we see it neither as it exists in itself, nor as it exists in man; we see it neither in individual Christians, nor in the Christian church, as the sum of all individual Christians. In the individual's external life its effects are visible, not its substance; and even these effects, from which we infer its existence, are only unreliable signs; for the natural tree may bear fruit so much like that of the spiritual, that we cannot be absolutely certain which has borne it. No man

can say of his brother, with absolute certainty, that he is a true believer. And although the whole body of those in whom Christ has been formed, does make its existence manifest by the use of its privileges and the discharge of its duties; and although we are made certain of its existence in a particular place by infallible marks; yet the evidence of its existence, and the source of our knowledge of its nature, are not sense. The marks by which we know the body to exist, are not the body itself. The church is, and in order to be the body of Christ, must be essentially invisible. She possesses not a single essential attribute by which she is visible. If it were not for the instructions of the Holy Spirit, we would be ignorant, not only of her nature, but even of her very existence. We would see men and their deeds, and would know them to be a peculiar organization; but that which is the very life of the organization, without which it is a mere human society, not the church of Jesus Christ, we could never see and never know. We learn that there is a church of Christ, and what are her characteristics, from Holy Scripture: we know it by faith. We learn that this church exists in any given place, not because we see her there, but because the means of grace, which will accomplish that whereunto they are sent, are used there. But the means of grace are not the church: in them we have evidences only by faith; to our mere senses they prove nothing, because there is no *natural* connection between these means and the church. The Holy Catholic Church is an object of faith, not of sight.

We are not forgetting that the church is composed of men, and that these are visible. We know that their visible part, the body, is sanctified as well as the soul, and that it consequently belongs also to the church. We know that holy men may be seen, even if their inward holiness may not. But a congregation of professed holy men is not necessarily a holy congregation; the probability would be, in any given instance, that it is not, on account of there being some unholy individuals among them. We would call it holy only by a figure of speech, predicating of the whole, what is strictly true only of a part. Then, literally, the holy congregation is not visible; the holy congregation is in that which is styled holy, and which is visible. The men are seen, not the *holy* men, The church is not men, as such; it is men in whom Christ lives, and as such we see them not. But it is only as such that they are of the church at all. If we see them not as

such, we see a congregation of men, but not the church. She is invisible.

But there is a very good reason, notwithstanding, why the church has always been, and must always be, called visible as well as invisible. The congregation of *professed*, contains the congregation of *true* believers within itself: it is the church for human eyes, as the invisible is the church for God's who knoweth them that are his. The word church, it must be admitted, does not mean precisely the same thing in the two instances: the same object will not admit of two epithets, one of which excludes the other. It is taken in a narrow and in a broad sense. The church is the congregation of believers; the human beings in whom Christ lives. These believers confess their faith, and thus endeavor to manifest themselves as such; they band together under a certain form of government, and engage in certain acts, and are thus made known as the church. Those, and only those, who sincerely believe, are what they seem; and they form the church in reality. The congregation of professed believers has probably some whose faith is a mere pretence. It is the church notwithstanding; but the word is now used figuratively; it belongs to the believers, but for their sake it is applied to the whole body among whom they are, and among whom they are not distinguished by any visible mark. The organization is the church's; it is her confession and her government; and therefore the name church is correctly given it. All belonging to it are in the church, though constituent parts of her, i. e., real members, are only those who truly believe. This visible organization not only contains the members of the church, but also has all the rights and duties which belong to her. It is the church appearing, not in her essence, nor in any of her essential attributes—for she is invisible—but in her action, which is visible. All gifts of God are conferred through the visible church, and all those who receive these gifts unto salvation, act with the visible, but become members of the body of Jesus Christ, the invisible church. For our temporal dealings with the church, we need be concerned no further than with the visible congregation; in this are the means of grace, and all authority to use them for our salvation. But for our own safety, we must not rest content with belonging to the visible congregation; for although it is the church, because it embraces the true members within it, it embraces also those who are not true members: no man is sure of salvation because he belongs to it, although

whoever is saved will belong to it. Only to them who are in Christ Jesus is there no condemnation.

The distinction between the church invisible and visible, is of the greatest importance, both for doctrine and practice; it is no idle speculation. Without it there is no comfort in viewing the church, either in its present state, or in its past history; with it we shall be able to pursue our way through the mazes, into which the question of her unity introduces us, without becoming disheartened.

The church is one. Her unity is essential to her very existence. The Holy Catholic Church has ceased to be so soon as she ceases to be one, just as her great Head is one, and never can be otherwise. It is our Lord's purpose, as made known by the Gospel, to save men by gathering them into one body, through the impartation of his life, so that they might become his body. "When he saw the multitude he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd."—Matt. 9: 36. "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth."—Ib. 12: 30. "There shall be one fold and one shepherd."—John 10: 16. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not."—Matt. 23: 37. As this was our Savior's plan, so it was his prayer. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."—John 17: 20-21.

Now, we would mistake the meaning of such passages sadly, if we applied them solely, or even primarily, to a mere outward convention of professing christians. They mean far more than this. The illustration in the passage last quoted, according to which the union of christians in one body, is like the union of the Father and Son, ought to be an effectual safeguard against any such misinterpretation. The oneness of the Father and his only begotten, is surely something more than mere harmony of thought or of action. The Savior is the vine, of which believers are the branches, and these bring forth fruit, because the life of the vine is in them: they who, as withered branches, merely adhere to the vine outwardly, without being pervaded by its life, are not of it, and can yield no fruit.—John 15: 1-8. The unity is in the life of the body, which underlies all appearance of unity, not in the external harmony of the members, which is only the

result of an internal life-union. Nor is this view at all inconsistent with the final clause in John 17: 21, where the object of the Savior's prayer for unity among his members is stated to be: "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me." The argument for our Lord's divine mission is furnished always by the holy church: is furnished now, when divisions have become almost innumerable, and will be furnished, even if thousands more should arise. There is still one body to show that God hath sent him. Men know the fact, whether they perfectly understand it or not. However much the argument might be strengthened by external union among all christians, or however much is detracted from its force by their external divisions, it still stands independently of all untoward circumstances: there is one body striving to glorify God through faith in Christ Jesus. And the outward unity never could exist without the inward; the latter is a condition of the former; so that all the scriptures which speak of unity generally, must be referred to the internal, of which the external is a product. The purpose and prayer of our Lord are not frustrated by the errors of man, who, to suit many tastes, might prefer many churches.

As the Savior promised and prayed, so it came to pass. In the apostolic epistles the unity is described as really existing, notwithstanding the external divisions which had already arisen. "Ye are all one in Christ."—Gal. 3: 28. "He is our peace, who hath made both one."—Eph. 2: 14. It is not the goal yet to be attained at some future period, but attained already. And in Eph. 4: 4-6, this unity is not only asserted to be then existing, but it is also elucidated by pointing out the several unities which enter into the unity of the whole body. "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." That the word "body" in the passage, means the church, according to the context and Col. 1: 18, it is barely necessary to mention. Into this one body members are introduced, by being buried with the one Lord, by the one baptism into his death, Rom. 6: 3-6, becoming thus partakers of his life; members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.—Eph. 5: 30. The "one spirit" is thus given, Acts 2: 38, and works in us the "one faith," Eph. 2: 8, in the "one Lord," accompanying which is always "the one hope of our calling." The body is one by the one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope, one Fa-

ther and one spirit; and as all these unities meet in faith, as its cause, means, object and effect, the body is one in virtue of the one faith abiding in all whose life is Christ. It is the one congregation of believers. Whoever believes is in the unity of the church, is a child of the Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all. And he remains in this unity, notwithstanding his doctrinal or practical errors, so long as he continues to believe; for so long the Holy Spirit is not taken away.

This, of course, presupposes that there are errors consistent with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in our hearts. As regards our practice, few, we trust, will be disposed to question this; "for if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."—1 John 1: 8. The more, indeed, we understand the marvellous heights of God's grace, the more will be able and willing to acknowledge the stupendous depths of our sin. But not every offence is an expulsion of the spirit from our hearts, or a fall from grace. It is the continuance of the Holy Spirit's work, that enables us to see and repent of our iniquities; it is the grace of God remaining upon us, that gives us contrite hearts when we have done a wrong; and it is the continued presence of faith in the soul, that secures its forgiveness. Our faults are manifold, but we remain God's dear children still, if only our desire be to serve him, and our repentance be sincere when we see wherein we have failed. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous."—1 John, 2: 1. It is almost needless to say that to live in gross violation of God's holy law, and still to be sincerely penitent for our sins, is a contradiction. The earnest desire to walk worthy of God unto all pleasing, and the indifference to right or wrong, when lust or interest is involved, cannot grow together: recklessness and vigilance cannot kiss each other. When sin is once wilful, it is no longer a believer's sin, and will no longer be followed by immediate repentance and forgiveness. But every believer, with all his vigilance and prayer, has his infirmities which, if he were not a child of grace, would insure his condemnation, but which, because he is a sincere believer, and therefore penitent, are richly and daily forgiven. And so long as he remains a believer, he remains a member of the Lord's body, notwithstanding his sin.

But the same is also true with regard to doctrine: not every error excludes from the congregation of saints. The believ-

er is not necessarily infallible. "The entrance of God's word giveth light;" but this light still leaves it possible for us to be mistaken on some points: for our enlightenment, like our sanctification, is progressive and gradual. We are to "*grow* in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 3: 18; and in that degree in which growth in knowledge is yet possible for us, we evidently come short of perfection. Not as though we must necessarily hold and teach unscriptural opinions because we know but in part. Deficiency in knowledge is not in itself doctrinal error. Many points of doctrine are never presented to our minds, and are therefore never rejected, although they are not consciously accepted. We say consciously, because the whole truth is really embodied in a very small compass, and is thus received by many, who never learn to know all the particulars which it involves. The Apostles' Creed contains a summary of all the christian doctrine, and whoever believes it, has the whole christian faith. Yet in developing it, and making specifications of its contents, men may err. They depart from the analogy of faith, and thus fall into inconsistencies. Errors may even be introduced, which overthrow the very foundation, i. e., which are no longer erroneous developments of the true faith, but human speculations substituted for the rejected truth. The objective faith is dropped because the subjective has departed: the faith which is believed has vanished because there was no faith to believe it. But it is evident that, while we are not yet perfect in knowledge, we may mistake the contents of that which we firmly believe. We may have the faith which believes, and yet be in error as to what is all implied in the faith which is believed. The foundation is firmly held, but incongruous materials are laid upon it. Now, the faith which believes does not depart, because we have unwittingly mistaken stubble for gold. A man may still be a believer, though he have made the mistake. We have the examples of holy men in all ages, men whose faith is unquestioned, who were not only rebuked by others for erroneous doctrine, but who, by recanting, rebuked themselves. Were they not believers while they held the non-fundamental errors? Their recantation show that they were. But were not those just as well who, because they never saw their mistake, did not recant. It would be the very summit of uncharitableness to consider a man lost, and treat him as such, because he was in error, without any regard to the character of the error itself, or of the person holding it. The former

may be non-fundamental, i. e., may be but an inconsistency which does not by any means subvert the foundation. The latter may be a true believer, who receives the error not wittingly, but because the truth is not known, or, if known, seems to him, from defect of light to illustrate it as truth, to be an error. Faith may remain in both cases. If only the error be not held in spite of the better light, and be not subversive of the foundation, its retention is not a fall from grace nor a despite to the Holy Spirit. But whilst we insist upon it that not every error is fatal, we wish to guard against the misconception, or false conclusion, according to which it is forthwith pronounced indifferent. Fatal or indifferent are not the only alternatives. No sin in practice is indifferent, yet our hopes were indeed vain, if all were absolutely fatal. Every sin in doctrine is dangerous, whether fundamental or not. It is so, not only because we are accountable for the light which we might have enjoyed, and the acceptance of which might have preserved us from the mistakes made, but also because one error opens the way for another and a more dangerous. Each false doctrine is a step, however small, towards the establishment of a system growing out of our own minds, and subversive of that which is revealed. It is therefore of most grave importance, even though by the restraining grace of God it does not always eventuate in such ruin. The consequences may be averted, and cannot, therefore, fairly be considered as necessarily involved in the error, and the sin may be forgiven among those secret faults, for the pardon of which believers daily pray.—Ps. 19: 12. Thus both those who sin in practice, and those who sin in doctrine, may remain believers, and consequently living members of the congregation of saints. All the baptized who, notwithstanding their faults, cling sincerely to their one Lord in the one faith, being thus daily cleansed from all their sins, are of the church, the "one body." Here there is unity, and no schism. The church is invisible, composed of believers wherever found, and whatever called, and therefore she is one: there cannot be two or more bodies of believers; for those very characteristics which would render them totally distinct from each other, and heterogeneous, would stamp one or the other as unbelievers.

The church, therefore, has a unity belonging to her very essence. She always was, and always will be, one. Her essential unity is not disturbed by the divisions in her outward appearance. The members of the various christian denomi-

nations are either of the one church, or not of Christ's church at all: there is no intermediate position in which they could be not of the *one* church, and yet of the church. The promise, "there shall be one fold and one shepherd," is already realized. Though all christians cannot, in this world, be gathered together in one place, yet are they all one in Christ Jesus. Though they have not all the same forms of government, and the same ceremonies, yet have they one Lord. Though they have not even the same doctrine in all particulars, yet have they the one faith and the one baptism, if they be christians at all. No diversities among them can break the oneness of the Lord's body. For so long as these diversities are consistent with the in-dwelling of the one spirit, and the existence of the one faith in the soul, so long there is no rent in the body: so soon as they grieve away the spirit, and make shipwreck of the faith, there is a simple falling away from, not a division in the church.

We are offering no apology for sects; we have no desire to remove out of sight the sin of heresy and schism. These are usually too much overlooked already. It behooves us to warn against them, not to extenuate. But there is discomfort enough in the present aspect of the church, without adding uncomfortable error. It is meet to call the attention of sincere minds, who see only discouragements on every side, because of the many sects around them, to the consoling fact that there is a oneness underlying all. We need not despair: God is present with his church every day. But we must not treat the outward divisions with indifference. Although they do not put asunder what God hath joined together in his beloved, yet they are evils whose pernicious consequences we, in the present times, incur little danger of overrating.

The church must render her presence upon earth discernible. This necessity lies in her nature and design. Not only must the individuals of whom she is composed, come forth to the light, not as the manner of some is, secluding themselves in dark retreats, but they must come forward as a body, with christian confession in all its branches, and using those gracious means by which the body edifies itself, and increases the number of its members. Whatever is intended for this world must, in some way, come under the cognizance of men's senses; there must be some sign indicating its presence. The church in becoming visible, does but obey a

common law. Even that which is strictly spiritual in its nature, attains its end among men by some corporeal means. By these the church must do her work. The word, which is the power of God unto salvation, must have an audible or visible sign as its vehicle, thus, as a sensible thing, conveying the spirit of God through the senses to the spirit of man. Baptism requires material contact between water and man's body, though the invisible gift of regeneration, which it brings, influences his spiritual nature. As with the sacrament of communion with the Lord's body and blood: there is a visible earthly, and an invisible heavenly element—a spiritual and a corporeal, mysteriously united for that mystery of sense and spirit, man. The means of grace are signs, not of an absent gift merely typified, but of a gift always present with them, and conveyed by them, and of whose invisible presence they visibly assure us. And if we could see more deeply into the mystery of man and his redemption, we would no doubt perceive that these means of grace, corporeal-spiritual, visible-invisible as they are, exert an influence upon our bodies, as well as upon our souls. This is more than intimated in the case of the Holy Supper, the crowning mystery of all, not only in the indication given of an intimate relation between its operation and the resurrection of the body, John 6, but also in the plain scriptural statement respecting its influence upon our bodily health, 1 Cor. 11. We read of no spiritual influence exerted upon man without the intervention of corporeal means. The former comes upon us through the latter, whether it affects the body in its transit or not: so much is certain. The Zwinglian, and all similar spiritualistic notions of an immediate exercise of the Holy Spirit's power for man's salvation, are wholly without foundation in holy scripture. Even on the day of Pentecost, when, as is usual in the beginnings of all great epochs, there was much that we must consider extraordinary and miraculous, the spirit was not imparted without all visible, material means, as his bearers and signs of his presence. Now, from this law, requiring all spiritual things, which are intended to exercise an influence in this world, to assume a corporeal form, the church, as we have already observed, is not exempted. Though in her very essence she is a spiritual house which we cannot see, yet must she show her existence. She must have an external form, underlying which will be the invisible reality: she must become visible. The administration of the means of grace—those corporeal bearers of spiritual

power—is given to her; and in dispensing them, and properly receiving them, she becomes visible; they are the external signs which unmistakably indicate her presence. We see her, where these are, precisely in the same sense in which we see the impartation of a spiritual gift when we see the means used with which it is inseparably connected. She cannot do her work invisibly: she cannot impart or receive grace invisibly, she can do it only in the sight and hearing of men. And to do it all decently and in order, she organizes herself externally, visibly, and discharges her duty, and uses her privileges, just as though there were not a deeper organization back of all, which is each member's great comfort, but with which, in our external relations, we have nothing to do. For this world this visible body is the church, and with it must we have all our visible dealings. There is no appeal to an invisible, except in the one question of final salvation; for in this God's eye, who sees what is invisible to us, is alone concerned. The visible church is thus necessary, to give and to receive grace, which cannot be done invisibly, although not all who profess to receive grace are the saved, but those who receive it really by faith, i. e., the invisible church. The destruction of the visible church would involve the ruin of the invisible, because it would imply the destruction of those means by which alone the invisible can receive additions to her membership. If the church is to be at all, she must be visible.

Moreover, the necessity of the church visible, is apparent also from those sacrificial acts, by which she is required to manifest her gratitude to God, and to give him the glory. These can just as little be performed invisibly as the sacramental. The duty of confession is only second to that of believing. The first requisite after becoming a child of light is, to let the light shine. What is in the heart must show itself. And it is to be particularly observed, that the continuance in a state of grace, and therefore the final salvation, is ordinarily made dependent upon such showing. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—Rom. 10: 10. This is in accordance with our Savior's words: "whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."—Matt. 10: 32-3; Luke 12: 8. The reasons for this are obvious. The glory of God cannot be promoted

by a concealment of that which he has done for our souls: it must come forth, that he may have the praise, and that others may also learn to adore him. To this end are we made a royal priesthood, that we might show forth the praises of him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.—1 Pet. 2: 9. Every christian becomes thus a preacher of righteousness, striving to make God's praise glorious all around him, and laboring to make known to others that name, by which alone men can be saved. So the natural tendency of things inward to externalize themselves, pushes the faith outward in the form of confession, that it may redound to the Redeemer's praise. If faith exist at all in a saving form, it must come forward to the light: for this, as we have seen, there are internal and external motives, the resistance of which will jeopardize the very existence of faith. Believers, therefore, necessarily become visible, as well by the administration and reception of the means of grace, as by the consequences of right reception, namely, christian confession in words and works.

All these external acts require the union of believers in a congregation. Not each individual christian, isolated from his brethren, is intended thus to become visible, but the whole body, of which each individual is a member. The design never could be accomplished by many persons, each of whom stood separate from all the rest. It would be the utmost selfishness, and therefore inconsistent with all christian character, for each one to presume to be his own church, dispensing to himself the means of grace, according to his own selfish pleasure, and confessing his faith, according to his own bad taste, apart from all others. The means of grace never were given to individuals to be thus abused: they belong to the church. And the deepest yearnings of the heart for communion with kindred souls—yearnings which God mercifully satisfies in the communion of saints—would be thus trampled upon. It is not in God to permit such indecency and disorder, and not in christian men to wish such misery. The common faith unites the members of the one body to labor, to suffer and to rejoice together; and he who would stand wholly isolated, could do so only because he has no sympathy in faith and hope with other believers, i. e., only because he is no believer at all. Hence we read that the first christians were together, and had all things in common, Acts 2: 44, and that such as should be saved were added unto the church, 47. Hence too the exhortation: "let us consider one another

er, to provoke unto love and to good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is." Heb. 10: 24-5. All the people are to praise God and confess his name together. "Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus, that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God."—Rom. 15: 5-6. Thus a united front was presented to the enemy, and thus the early christians sustained each other, by bearing their burdens and tasting their joys together. And thus it must ever be. For the Lord is ever present where christians, though but two or three are gathered together in his name, not where each man stands separately in his own name. The great work which Christ has enjoined upon his people, not only requires many men and many means, but many men and means united; and only when the work is done by a body acting in his name, can it redound to his glory. This truth was not overlooked in the first ages of the church, as it but too frequently is now. Then works of charity were not only done to alleviate human suffering, but also, and primarily, to show forth God's praise: the noble means had a still nobler end. Hence not every individual did what he could, independently of the church; he did not act in his own name, and reap the praise of his loving deeds; he was not the dispenser of his own alms, knowing that individual gifts, however faithfully and humbly bestowed, are more likely to bring to the donor, than to him who renders us merciful, the recipient's thanks and praise. For how does the recipient know that it was for Christ's sake that mercy was shown, rather than from some personal considerations or self-interest? The humble christian, therefore, laid his possessions at the apostles' feet, and brought his alms as sacrifices to God, to be bestowed upon the necessitous, or applied to noble ends through God's own institution, that God only, not any man, might have the glory. The donor's humble heart could not conceive that it was of any importance that he should be known as the giver: his end was fully accomplished when he was conscious of having increased those means by which Christ's Bride glorifies her Lord. The present trumpeting abroad of individual names, with praises for individual works of love, belongs to the selfishness of the age which envies God his glory. The church was intended to be, and anciently was, the recipient of individual offerings to every christian charity, and the dispenser of these treasures in her Lord's name; and surely our pri-

vate judgment ought to be sufficiently humble to suppose, that she knows at least, as well how to distribute and how to economize, as the individual. Thus is it apparent that the church must be visible, as a church—a corporate body—both to administer those means of grace by which she is sustained and enlarged, and to discharge those duties by which, while she is a minister of mercy among men, she gives glory to God in the highest. She is a visible church, otherwise men's souls would not be saved, the saving grace which is visibly dispensed being wanting, and the command, "whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him," could not be obeyed.

Much of that which has been already said, tends to render probable the unity of the church visible. That she is designed to be visibly one, wherein this oneness consists, and how she is affected by divisions, are topics of great importance for the understanding of her unity, and merit our more particular attention.

That the visible church is designed to be one, is clear from the fact, that unity is an essential attribute of her invisible nature. So far as possible, the attributes of the one must be transferable to the other. Not as though they could always be predicated with the same necessity of each. The visible is striving after much that the invisible has already attained. But she strives after it in accordance with God's holy will. It is the goal that God has placed before her. The church, e. g., is holy—the congregation of saints. This applies to her invisible nature, as composed of those who are in Christ Jesus. But the outward congregation must strive to realize this attribute in itself. Not as though the church ceased to be holy on account of those in the congregation who are mere hypocrites. Far from it: she is holy in spite of all the unholy members. But her aim must be to sanctify all, and therefore, she must put away from herself the person who is incorrigibly unholy. It is God's design in reference to all: they are not called unto uncleanness, but unto holiness. The visible church is designed to be pure, and so far as she comes short of this, she sins, and needs daily cleansing by the blood of Jesus: those who will not be cleansed, if discovered, are cast out. So, as the church is one invisibly, it is God's design that she should be visibly one, and this oneness must, accordingly, be her aim. God gave pastors and teachers for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we

all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man.—Eph. 4: 11–13. Not as though the defect of outward unity could divide the invisible church: she remains, and remains one, as God instituted her, in spite of all man's sin. But as a departure from her holiness is a sin, so must a departure from her unity be a sin also: a sin that in both cases is ruinous, if obstinately and impenitently persisted in, but which, in neither case, absolutely excludes the sinners from Christ's body and the hope of salvation. Whether it does cut off from the living vine or not, will depend upon the peculiar character of the offence and the offender, i. e., whether the former is of such a character as to overthrow the foundation of faith, and whether the latter sins in spite of the grace which would restrain him, or merely from a mistaken view of his duty. But in any case, the departure from unity is a departure from God's design respecting the visible church, as this design is revealed to us in the unity of the invisible: the one should be, because the other is, one; and this oneness cannot be neglected without great danger, just as the will of God in any other respect cannot be neglected without sin.

But we are not left to conclude the unity of the visible church from mere inference. The scriptures directly assert and urge it. It will not be contended that reference is had only to the invisible church, in such passages as these: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment."—1 Cor. 1: 10. "God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked: that there should be no schism in the body."—Ib. 12: 24–5. The unity enjoined here is manifestly external, as well as internal. Stress is always to be laid upon the latter, as by far the most important, indeed as the only basis upon which the former is possible. But never can the truth lie in the maintenance of one, to the exclusion of the other. The relation between the two is similar to that between faith and its confession. The one underlies the other, and renders it necessary. Not only must we be "one in Christ," by the possession of his life, but we must also, as a consequence, be of "the same mind," and "speak the same thing." Thus only will the argument for the Savior's divine mission, from the oneness of his disciples in him, as presented in John 17: 21, receive all the force

of which it is capable. The argument holds good, as we have already observed, even in spite of schisms in the visible body: the church's oneness, as a body of Christ's disciples, does not depend upon anything external: but if outward unity will in any case make the argument apparent to one who sees it not, or make it strong to one who thinks it weak, the duty of external oneness to render the internal manifest, must be evident. And one body, visibly one, is a stronger argument, at least to some of "the world," for the divine efficacy of that grace and truth, the object of which is asserted to be the gathering together into one, that which was scattered abroad, than the one body visibly rent and divided.

The divisions forbidden in the passages which we have cited, necessarily refer to the visible, not the invisible church. For there can be no schism in the Lord's body, in any other than the external sense. There may be different organizations, all claiming the name of church. But each one will either be of the Lord's mystical body or not. If it is, then there is no division; if it is not, it no more deserves the name of Christ's church than any other human organization whatever, i. e., it is not a division of the church, but a party wholly different from it. The schism can only be in the visible church, leaving the one body mystical unaffected. Those who are externally separated from others, are not, therefore, lost: they may still be living branches of the living vine, although they sin by their schism. If they are separated from the Lord's body and life, they are no longer any part of the church. They are a mere "Benevolent Society," or something similar, outside of the church; and if they commenced in the spirit, and ended in the flesh, so as to form thus an independent society, disowned by the church, they are not a schism, but an apostacy. Look at it as we will, the church, in the proper sense, is, and must be, one: the invisible church is undivided and indivisible. There is one Lord and one body. A schism cannot possibly have place in any other domain than that of visibility. Now, as the scriptures forbid divisions in the church, and these can occur only in the visible organization, unity in the visible church is God's holy will.

Wherein this unity consists, is a question concerning which there is not only a variety, but also an utter contrariety of opinions among christians. It will not be expected that we should enter into a particular examination of these conflicting theories: the task might prove endless. If the truth

can be ascertained, it will itself be a refutation of all opposing error. But the truth surely cannot lie in those systems which make something indifferent in itself essential to unity. That, without which the church may remain herself, cannot be a mark of her existence as one. The mark of visible, must have some necessary connection with her invisible unity. She is not one visibly, because all her members are in one locality, for they are not, and cannot be; nor because all agree in holding the same forms and ceremonies of human appointment; for man's inventions, however decent and profitable in themselves, cannot be a test of membership in a divine institution, as the church is admitted to be. The rejection of man's devices is not necessarily schism: not necessarily, we say, because in some instances it may be, not in itself, but as a manifestation of a schism existing internally before. Visible unity must consist in preserving, so far as this may be visibly done, the essentials to invisible unity: it will accordingly find its principle in the life of Christ, and those means by which that life is imparted to us. Hence the truth of the Augsburg Confession, Art. VII, cannot be gained: "It is sufficient for the true unity of the church, that the Gospel is therein preached in harmony with, and according to its true intent and meaning, and that the sacraments are administered in consonance with the word of God. Nor is it necessary to the true unity of the christian church, that uniform traditions, rites and ceremonies of human appointment should be everywhere observed."

This must necessarily be referred to the church visible. For the church is not invisibly one, by virtue of her unity of doctrine and administration of sacraments, nor do the confessions ever so teach. They do not deny the christianity of all who, in any degree, hold false doctrine. They insist that false doctrine is, in its nature, unchristian: and who would deny this? They accordingly condemn it, and warn against it. They also condemn those persons who harbor it, so far as they are found fighting against God, by fighting against any article of revealed truth. How could they do otherwise if their professions are to be considered at all sincere? But this condemnation of errorists no more implies the belief of their final damnation, than the condemnation of vice and of the vicious person implies the belief in his inevitable ruin. We sin daily: do we not condemn the sin which we know ourselves to have committed? But every true believer knows

how unreal such condemnation of our sin always is, when it falls only upon the abstract sin, leaving us, the sinners, quite unscathed. We condemn not only one sin, but ourselves who commit the sin: there can be no sincere repentance without this. And yet when we condemn ourselves, or rather apply the condemnation of the law to *ourselves*, not merely to *our offences*, we are far from supposing that we are everlastingly damned—that we cannot at all be saved. The word of God condemns us all, so far as we sin in doctrine or in practice: condemns us, too, for those sins of which we, perhaps, never become conscious: and yet we poor sinners by no means infer from this that, according to the scriptures, none but those who are pure as angels, can be saved. Our confessions do “reject” and “condemn,” not only errors, but also those who hold them; but they do so only as the scriptures do so, declaring the error, and the errorist, so far as he holds the error, unchristian. The confessions do not teach that every departure from the form of sound words, necessarily results in damnation. There may be, and we sincerely believe there are, those who in some respects hold and teach unsound doctrine, not “in harmony with, and according to the true intent and meaning” of the Gospel, who are still in Christ Jesus, not having made shipwreck of the “one faith,” and therefore true members of the “one body,” the invisible church. To the true unity of the congregation of believers, harmony in every point of doctrine is not necessary, so long as the life in Christ by faith is preserved; that is, there may be differences in such points as do not affect the foundation immediately; for so long errors, though dangerous both objectively and subjectively, are consistent with the state of grace. The article quoted, therefore, defines the essentials of visible, not invisible church unity. In this view we are confirmed by the denial that rites and ceremonies of human appointment are necessary to true unity: a denial of which the church would never have thought, had the intention been to define the unity of the church invisible.

The true unity of the visible church consists not, then, in any ceremony or rite of human appointment, or in any human tradition whatever. It would, indeed, be very desirable to have the same form of government, the same order of divine worship, the same observance of festivals and fasts, the same rites and ceremonies, &c., in all places. The advantages resulting from such uniformity would be manifold. But they are not essential, precisely because they are not divine, and

may therefore vary largely without schism. As regards these things, "let every one be persuaded in his own mind." Decency and order must be preserved; but whether they be observed by Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or Congregational rules, is utterly immaterial, because only the general rule is divine, the special a matter of mere expediency. We cannot, in things of this kind, find any tests of unity: these must lie in the domain of the necessary and divine, not in that of the expedient and human.

The only test can be that given in our noble Augustana, namely, the purity of the word and the sacraments, as the means essential to the invisible, and therefore also to the visible church. As long as the means of grace are validly administered, there must be a christian church; for these means will accomplish that whereunto they are sent, at least in some cases. It were sheer unbelief to deny this. The invisible church is thus secure of her existence, so long as the means of grace exist: for they continue adding unto the one body them that shall be saved. The mark of outward unity is the outward manifestation of that which has been inwardly embraced, and which renders the possessor a branch of the vine. We are members of the invisible church by faith, which is the internal product of the word and the sacraments; we are members of the visible church by our confession, which is the external product of these same means of grace. As faith without works is dead, so must it be dead without confession, of which, indeed, works form a part. The most intelligible, and therefore ordinarily the only adequate confession, is by means of words. Our faith cannot become manifest by mere deeds, except in its most general form: works cannot distinguish the Arian or Pelagian from the orthodox christian. The mere assertion, moreover, that we believe what the Bible teaches, is not the confession required; for neither will this mark the difference between the believer of the truth and the holder of falsehoods: errorists and heretics are not usually remarkable for their denial of the formal principle of Protestantism. Besides, it must be a narrow faith that believes only this one article of christian doctrine: "the Bible is true," caring nothing about the truth which it contains. That religious system, which deems no other doctrine necessary, must be superlatively lean. The church must have her confession to become visible. A human organization will remain such, no matter how much its members meet to sing and pray and preach, mimicking the church, and striving to

undermine by mimicking her. And her confession must be specific, that is, it must state, not only where the truth is believed to be found, but also what the truth is which faith apprehends. The confession will mark a congregation as christian, contradistinguished from all mere human societies, and as orthodox, in no way participating in the errors of those who, while professing to believe the scriptures, reject the truth which it teaches. It is accordingly in the domain of christian confession, that we must look for the grounds and tests of divisions in the visible church. As the verbal confession is the most important, disunion usually lies in false doctrine and false administration of the sacraments, i. e., doctrine and administration not in accordance with Holy Scripture. And because they are a consequence of doctrinal errors, of which they are generally an actual confession, practical errors, as contradistinguished from doctrinal, afford another root of divisions. The manifestation of internal evil by a false confession, is usually styled heresy; the manifestation of the same by false conduct, leading to separations, is termed schism. Both, considered as confessions, manifest an unscriptural state of mind and heart. The nature of each, and their relation to each other, we shall endeavor to point out.

First of all, it is necessary to guard against the error, as though the preaching of false doctrine, or the unscriptural administration of the sacraments, in any congregation, would render it necessarily schismatical. The congregation may be wholly innocent. The breach of unity lies in the false confession, which demands the unscriptural use of the means of grace, or which, at least, tolerates any unsound words. Occasional errors may occur, in spite of the pure confession; but where the latter is found, the error remains an individual affair of the minister, with which the congregation is not chargeable, provided it discharge its duty in guarding against the continuance of the evil. When it tolerates the false doctrine, it is, of course, already on the way to schism, the confession being a mere dead letter while the hearts of the people are indifferent to it. The position of the congregation, not that of its minister, decides whether the members are in schism.

The words heresy and schism have originally the same meaning, and are used synonymously in holy scripture. But in ecclesiastical writers they have come to be the representatives of two different, though closely connected ideas. A

heresy is a departure from the truth, as held by the church, in a fundamental point. It is, therefore, a separation from the church, at least in mind, if not in the outward action. But the latter eventually must result from the former, if there be any earnestness in maintaining the truth. The heretic will, if the difference between him and the congregation seem important, proclaim his conviction, and his withdrawal or expulsion must soon follow. The result is schism, i. e., the external separation from the congregation, and the organization of another. But this separation sometimes takes place where there are no conscious doctrinal differences. Hence, although heresy always results in schism, if persisted in, schism does not always presuppose heresy. Ethical, as well as doctrinal differences, may cause schisms. But when there is an internal separation from the church, whether originating in opposite convictions, or in discordant tastes and feelings, the doctrine of those separating externally, will not be left unaffected by it. Hence the confession says nothing of those causes of divisions which apparently lie outside of the domain of doctrine, leaving them all to be traced back to some disagreement in the word and sacraments, without which disagreement, though other causes may have operated in that direction, there could be no external breach.

That practical and personal differences are frequently the antecedents of ecclesiastical ruptures, experience has shown. The division here does not seem to be caused by any doctrinal discordance. Indeed, sometimes altar is set up against altar, for no better reason than that some disaffected persons do not like the minister, or some of the members of the congregation, or some peculiar forms or ceremonies in the public worship. At first sight such unreasonableness seems to have nothing whatever to do with doctrine. And yet if we look again, we will not fail to perceive a connection. For the refusal to sacrifice personal preferences in matters indifferent to the preservation of unity, implies one of these two things: either that schism is thought to be no sin, and can, therefore, for the gratification of any whim or taste, be produced with impunity; or, that those indifferent matters are considered of such moment, as to justify schism, in other words, that *adiaphora* are fundamentals. That both these alternatives are grave errors, is obvious; and that those who adopt either cannot be considered as still preaching the Gospel in harmony with the word of God, and fully agreeing in doctrine with the church that so preaches, is quite evident. Besides, it

will generally be found that schismatics have some pet notion which they would be glad to introduce, but which the church, to the great wounding of their pride, refuses to adopt, or in any way to countenance. History therefore furnishes but few examples of sects which did not, sooner or later, manifest their doctrinal opposition to the church, whatever their professions of agreement may have been. A sect which has ceased to give itself a reason for its separation from the body—a reason, too, more specious than that of personal or adiaphoristic differences—will not long maintain its separate organization. Some important difference must exist, to justify it in its own eyes. The permanent breach of love implies the breach of faith; and it is therefore unfair to represent our confession as teaching, that the unity of the church is not broken, so long as there is no manifest heresy proclaimed by either party, even if altar be erected against altar. The confession takes for granted that when party contends against party, both cannot have the word pure. The internal and external separation, heresy and schism; are both opposed to the means of grace in their purity, and are therefore both represented as breaking the unity of the visible church.

Heresy is sometimes defined as the denial of truth in general, without special reference to the importance of the truth denied, or to the intention or character of him who denies. Both these points must, however, enter into any definition that would aim at correctness as well as precision.

Every truth which it has pleased God to reveal, is of unspeakable worth, no matter whether in our systems of doctrine it occupies a prominent or subordinate position. The truth is one, and each part must, therefore, challenge the respect which all truth deserves. But all parts of truth are not equally essential. The old systematic theologians were right in making distinctions where the differences are so palpable. They divided the several truths which are the objects of faith, into fundamental and non-fundamental articles. Not as though they believed that any revealed truth could be unimportant, and therefore treated with indifference. They knew right well that what was important enough to be revealed, could not be too unimportant to be received. The non-fundamentals are those which could be ignored, and even in some circumstances, denied without damnation. They are not absolutely necessary to salvation. When the believer rejects them, under the impression that they are unscriptural error, he does not thereby become an unbeliever: the foun-

dation still remains. When they are known and acknowledged to be revealed truths, they of course become subjectively fundamental: their denial is as much an indication of unbelief as the rejection of any confessedly fundamental doctrines. The fundamentals are such as are necessary to salvation; though they are not all necessary in precisely the same sense. They may be divided into two classes: first, those of which it is dangerous even to be ignorant, inasmuch as they are the necessary foundation of faith, without which, in the case of those whose years require the activity of faith, faith itself cannot exist; and secondly, those of which we may be ignorant, but which, when known, we cannot, under any circumstances, deny without grieving the Holy Spirit. The term heresy should be confined to those who reject fundamentals, not applied indiscriminately to all errorists. Non-fundamentals may be rejected without heresy. In making this assertion, we are quite sure of using the word as our fathers used it. "Heresy," says Quenstedt, "is not every error contrary to the word of God, but such error as subverts the foundation of faith." "Properly to call any one a heretic," says Gerhard, "it is necessary that his error infringes upon the very foundation of faith." As far as the object of our faith is concerned, we are therefore justified in saying, that only fundamental error is heresy, and that it is uncharitable to apply the odious name to any other.

But another question remains. The character of the errorist, as we have already stated, must not be left out of view, in defining heresy. In the words of Gerhard, we must assert it to be a characteristic of the heretic, "that malice and pertinacity are conjoined with his error, so that he obstinately defends it, notwithstanding that he has been frequently warned." The believer is not forthwith a heretic, because he has inadvertently and temporarily made a fundamental mistake. He must be warned again and again, and only by being selfishly obstinate, and refusing to be enlightened and to yield, he becomes a heretic. But the fact of his temporarily holding a fundamental error, does not, in itself, constitute him a heretic, this term implying moral obliquity as well as doctrinal fundamental error. This is plain from both scriptural and ecclesiastical usage of the term.

In holy scripture the word occurs in various connections, sometimes synonymously with the now usual meaning of the term "schism." It is applied to parties among the Jews, as "the sect of the Sadducees," Acts 5: 17, and "the sect of

the Pharisees," Acts 15: 5, in both which cases it is "heresy" in the original. In the same sense of party it is applied by enemies to the whole christian body, when this is called the "seet of the Nazarenes." Christians are here intended to be classed as a Jewish faction, with Pharisees and Sadducees. But the word is also applied, by the apostles themselves, to parties in the christian church, e. g., 1 Cor. 11: 19: "for there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." Here the evil disposition, the sin, is evidently implied. It is not merely an innocent mistake of the intellect, but an error of the heart also, concerning the subject of which the passage implicitly denies that he shall be approved. If any doubt should remain, as to this sense of the word in scripture, i. e., that it implies a wrong state of the heart, as well as of the head, it must be at once dispersed, when we remember that in Gal. 5: 20, "heresies" are classed among the "works of the flesh" and censured as such. Here they cannot be innocent mistakes, else it could not be said, as it is in the last passage, "that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." They are stubborn errors, maintained from carnal motives, in spite of all warning and instruction: errors permitted not as a probation to them who hold them, but to the saints, who, by the endurance of the trial should become manifest as the approved. Coincident with this, are the other passages of scripture in which the word occurs as applied to professing christians. "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them."—2 Pet. 2: 1. Hence St. Paul commands: "a man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject."—Titus 3: 10. We are therefore making no rash assertion, when we say that the biblical sense of the word "heretic," so far as it applies to professed christians, implies moral obliquity, as well as mental error, and that biblical usage does not justify its application to one who is innocently in error, i. e., whose conscience has never been properly enlightened by receiving "the first and second admonition." As far as the word is used of parties among those not professing christianity, we can, of course, have nothing to do with it here: probably no one will dissent from the remarks of Gerhard, that no one can properly be called a heretic, who has not, by baptism, been received into the visible church. And with this sense the ecclesiastical usage corresponds throughout.

A heretic is one, then, who holds fundamental error in spite of the scriptures. Heresy can therefore only be imputed to parties who, having the will to appear as christians, have fallen away from the foundation of christian faith. As long as individuals cling to the foundation, and are unwilling to swerve from it, humbly imploring pardon for any fault which they see, but unable to see the error which others perceive in their doctrine, they are errorists, but not heretics. As such, they must not be at once rejected, but patiently instructed; and under faithful instruction, one of two things will soon take place: they will either receive the grace of God for their enlightenment, and accordingly put away that which God's word shows them to be erroneous, or they will reject the light, and obstinately retain the error, and thus, if it be fundamental, become heretics. Then, if they do not separate from the visible church before, they must be cut off by excommunication, and thus become a heretical sect. Not every sect is such. All heresy is schism, but not vice versa. Every sect is in error, but not heretically so, and not all must, in consequence, be treated alike. Those which are heretical, in the sense here defined, we can of course have nothing whatever to do with: they must be denied to be brethren at all, and can be styled christians, only because they have received baptism, and thus were once in the church, from which they have now fallen. Had they never been baptized, they would be simple Jews or Pagans, Turks or infidels, according as their opinions coincided with the one or the other. But errorists, who are not heretics, obviously require christian consideration and regard, as brethren in Christ; and the nature of our relation to them this is the proper place to consider. Two questions require to be answered here: 1. Is schism, when not founded upon heresy, to be treated as innocent? 2. Is it the church's duty to unite and coöperate with sects not heretical? These questions now claim our earnest attention.

In answering the first, justice requires a distinction to be made between the persons and the errors which they may hold, and this distinction will be found conducive to clearness. As regards the errors themselves, then, we can only pronounce them worthy of all condemnation, whether they be of prime or secondary importance. For that which conflicts with revelation, even though the point assailed have no perceptible bearing upon our soul's eternal interests, and may, under

some circumstances, be safely dispensed with, can only be of evil, and must be treated as God's and our soul's enemy. The difference between fundamental and non-fundamental, is of no practical value in this respect. Considered in itself, all error is damnable, and all is, moreover, really dangerous; so that many who hold non-fundamental errors, although they are saved notwithstanding their errors, are saved "as by fire." Whatever may be our view of persons among the sects, it is evident that their errors may neither be ignored nor smoothed over, so as to appear right; and all attempts thus to palliate them, must be looked upon, by all whose spiritual sight is clear, as culpable indifference to God's truth, which is precious in all its parts. That the charge of uncharitableness, made against those who rebuke errors wherever found, can only originate in a want of true religious earnestness and reverence for Jehovah's word, and in ignorance as well as inexperience of true christian charity in its highest form, on the part of those who, we fear too often without all charity, prefer the charge, needs but to be mentioned: it can need no proof to those who know and believe that God and his word challenges our whole heart, and that to this all else is secondary, and upon this all true love to our neighbor is dependent.

When we turn, however, to the person who holds the errors, our condemnation, if pronounced at all, evidently requires qualification. That errorists are not wholly innocent, under any circumstances, we sincerely believe: no man is innocent who sins in theory or in practice. Sin remains such, notwithstanding the virtuous intention of him who commits it. That our conscience is dark, so that it reproves not the wrong, in consequence of which we presume it right, is itself a sin. Ignorance and bluntness of conscience will not excuse error and vice. Our secret faults are faults which require remission, as well as those of which we are fully conscious. But ignorance may render error and vice not inconsistent with the continuance in Christ and his grace. That is, when we sin ignorantly, we may have that faith at the same time, which secures our remission daily, and richly. Whilst the law pronounces its condemnation upon all who sin, the Gospel still promises salvation to all that believe; so that although all sinners, whether such in doctrine or in practice, are condemned, there is still no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. And as sects not heretical may be in Christ Jesus, notwithstanding their error, truth does not

require that we should consider them lost, nor that we should treat them as aliens. They are our brethren still, though they be erring brethren.

But schism, even when it has not its origin in a heresy, is still a sin, and therefore, whether we may unite or coöperate with now heretical schismatics, does not turn merely upon the question whether they are brethren or not. We shall endeavor to ascertain the nature of the sin of schism, as distinguished from that of heresy. The practical question will then be of easy solution.

Heresy is theoretic schism, and must result in this practically. If those who hold it do not withdraw from the visible church, they must, after sufficient warning and instruction, be expelled. They are then, if they maintain an organization as a party, a sect—a heretical sect. Whether this excommunicated party be large or small, does not affect the case. The truth is not necessarily with the majority. The church is that party which retains the faith once delivered to the saints, even though it be but a small minority. Nor is that necessarily the church which expels an opposing party. Cases may happen, in which error becomes dominant, and refuses to tolerate truth. The errorists then excommunicate the faithful. This was the case in the Reformation. Those in error were in the majority, and, by refusing communion with those who preached the truth, became schismatics. Not every excommunication must be considered valid: only that which is bound by men in God's name, is bound in heaven. It is folly to suppose that men can forgive or retain sins according to their own arbitrary will. The remission and retention are truly as valid when pronounced by man, as if pronounced by God in person; but only when men use God's word, and pronounce them in God's stead. Absolution may be given, therefore, in any case; for Christ has really died for all, even the vilest, and the gift of remission, for Christ's sake, is ready for all, and is intended to be sincerely offered to all. It is ready, and can be validly offered, even to the impenitent, although we are forbidden to cast pearls before those whom we know to be swine. If men, by unbelief, reject the proffered gift, it is not rendered a nonentity by man's folly. The truth is, there must be a reality to offer, before man can exercise his liberty of choosing or rejecting it. It is absurd to blame men for the rejection of that which was never really offered for their acceptance. It is offered just as truly where it is rejected, as where it is accepted, so that

man's hypocritical repentance and faith renders not God's saving word, "son, thy sins are forgiven thee," a falsehood. It is true that moment and, if the word is received in faith, will be so forever. But the case is different with the retention of sins. In the use of the binding keys, the minister's mistake affects the validity of the act. God is not willing to retain all men's sins as he is to forgive, and man may therefore declare those retained which God has forgiven, and which, on account of the person's faith, remain forgiven. Man has, therefore, no right to use the keys for binding, unless there is unmistakable evidence of impenitent persistence in sin; and we are not bound to consider any person validly excommunicated, whose doctrine and life show forth God's praise, and against whom stubborn impenitence cannot be proven. Therefore, excommunication from any body, does not in itself render a man either a heretic or a schismatic. The party excommunicated in accordance with God's word, or withdrawing in opposition to God's word, is in schism.

But, as we have already observed, persons and parties may withdraw without pretending that the church from which they separate, is incorrigibly heretical. That they sin by so doing is evident from the passages of scripture which forbid divisions. It is manifest, moreover, that the only ground upon which separation is justifiable at all, is, that the body from which another separates, will not tolerate scriptural doctrine and practice, i. e., that the body separated from becomes heretical or schismatical. The sin of schism still exists, but it falls not upon those who come out from the erring party, but upon the latter itself. Mere personal tastes and opinions, without a reason in conscience, never can justify a transgression of the apostolic precept: "let there be no divisions among you." Every party is schismatical, therefore, that breaks off from the church, or from the existing body that is confessedly orthodox, without having any other than a merely selfish reason, as different tastes, opinions upon adiaphora, &c. Indeed, divisions or schisms are absolutely forbidden; we are permitted to separate from the congregation of true confessors on no account whatever; for those cases in which separation is said to be justifiable, involve no division at all on the part of those who are driven away by the impenitent continuance in wrong, and intolerance of right of the existing body, upon which the sin of schism necessarily falls. And as schism is forbidden, so continuance in it, under any circumstances whatsoever, is continuance in sin. And although

the schismatic may be saved, on the ground of his sinning from want of proper light, yet no man, knowing the sin, and impenitently remaining in it, can have well-founded hopes of salvation, inasmuch as he neglects to fulfil those conditions upon which alone the promise of pardon can be appropriated. Only when persons repent and cease to do evil, whatever self-denial it may cost, can they be assured that their iniquities are covered.

It follows as a necessary consequence from this, that sects or schismatics, whether heretical or not, must be shunned, lest we become partakers of their sin. And this conclusion the scriptures also explicitly inculcate. We are commanded to shun error, whether it is schismatic or not, and schism whether we perceive errors in the schismatic party or not. "Beware of false prophets," of whom many shall arise.—Matt. 7: 15; 24: 23-4. "Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch."—Acts 20: 30-1. "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers:" "come out from among them and be ye separate."—2 Cor. 6: 14-18. And these warnings refer not to their doctrine merely, to the exclusion of their fellowship. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them."—Rom. 16: 17. "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."—Titus 3: 10. "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 10: 11. And for this, the word of God affords ample reason, when it assures us that it is the nature of evil to eat around it, and contaminate all that comes in contact with it, Gal. 5: 9, and that by giving encouragement, in any way, to sin, we become ourselves participators in its guilt, Rev. 18: 4.

Not only are we warned against the doctrine and fellowship of sects, but we are also commanded to unite with those who remain in the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles. This is implied in the example shown us of the first disciples, Acts 2: 42, as well as in the duty of confession, Matt. 10: 32; Rom. 10: 9; for if we confess at all, we must confess the same thing as all other believers: refusal to join with them in word and work, is evidence that we are not of them. "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divi-

sions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."—1 Cor. 1: 10. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."—1 John 2: 19. The scriptures are so full upon this point, that it is a matter of astonishment how much they are disregarded, even by those who profess the highest reverence for the word and will of God.

However strong may be our conviction that external divisions are sinful, and that unity is our Master's will, it is plain from these prohibitions and commands, that it may not be sought as an end, to which all must consider everything else subordinate. Union with heretics and schismatics, is itself a sin, and must be vigilantly and prayerfully avoided. The only way of union is for the church to remain firm, refusing to countenance heresy and schism in any form, and for heretics and schismatics to repent and return to the church. If they will not, the sin is not upon the church, but upon the sects. Those who seek union among all, without requiring repentance and amendment of any sect, are guilty of these grievous errors: 1. They make unity consist in mere outward coöperation, without any internal agreement, or any proper manifestation of such agreement in unity of confession. This would be oneness in forms, without unity of spirit, and savors strongly of Romanism. 2. They make outward of more importance than inward unity, thus indifferently exalting man's self-invented marks of unity above those made essential by God's word, and sacrificing everlasting truth, merely to cry peace, peace, when there is no peace. 3. They deny the existence, or ignore the sinfulness of heresy and schism, in spite of the plain teachings of holy scripture; for that cannot be seriously believed to be a sin, which is left unrebuked, and for which no repentance is required. 4. They make the impression that nothing is certain objectively, and thus help to overturn the faith, by inculcating the error, that every thing is as we opine it to be. Private judgment is thus permitted to take the liberty of renouncing whatever is unpleasant, whether revealed or not, instead of being kept within proper limits, by insisting that its right is conditioned by the enlightenment of God's spirit, and the unconditional belief of God's revealed word, according to the letter of the canonical scriptures.

But whilst it is plain that christian duty requires us to mark heretics and schismatics, and avoid them, it is not so easy to decide, among the multitude of christian denominations existing at present, which are, and which are not, schismatical. The general principles upon which such a decision must be based, have already been pointed out. But the application of these principles to existing parties, evidently implies an investigation into the doctrines and history of each. One party separating from another now, is guilty of schism, if no reason, binding the conscience, can be alleged for such separation, that is, if the party separated from cannot be shown, or at least is not believed to be heretical or schismatical. The principle is schismatical, even if it be in fact merely a secession from a schism. But the denominations now existing, must be traced back to their origin, before it can be positively asserted that they are schismatical. They cannot be distinguished by their names, for when sects once abound, it becomes necessary, even for the church, to assume some specific name, besides that of christian, in order to prevent its being confounded with sects; nor from their geographical position: for sects are found almost everywhere beside the church. Whence came this or that denomination? If it originally came into being by an unjustifiable secession from the main body of christians, it is a sect; and unjustifiable is every secession upon grounds which are not sufficient to justify the excommunication of the other party from the church. For secession is a virtual expulsion of one or the other party from the visible body, implying, moreover, the charge of heresy against it, since if the error is not defended as a truth, it cannot be pronounced incorrigible, and if there is still hope of amendment, no division can be justified. Evidently sects cannot be distinguished merely by their doctrine, since cases have occurred in which there were divisions whilst the confession of the body separated from, was nominally retained: nominally, we say, for it has been observed that this is rarely the case in reality: and yet the separatists are a sect, because of the unnecessary division. And it may happen, on the other hand, that a body, not separatistic or schismatic, may hold false doctrine on some non-fundamental points. We repeat it, therefore, that the question is partly historical. After the corruption of the Roman church, which was incorrigible in its error, and refused even to tolerate the truth on various points of doctrine, the visible church was properly that body from which the Romanists declared them-

selves separate: the schismatic party was that which would not endure sound doctrine. But after one secession of this kind, the church offered no resistance to the truth, and to separate from the evangelical church, or from the Romanist, without entering the evangelical, would be nothing else than schism. But this general assertion must be qualified by the statement, that, as the church in one country need not necessarily stand in communication with the church in another, at the time of the Reformation the church visible might assume different forms in different lands, the German could be Lutheran, the English Episcopalian, the Swiss Reformed, without schism. But separations from any of these churches, in the land in which they assumed their original form, would undoubtedly be schism, unless those separating could assert them to be heretical or hopelessly corrupt. In our own land, again, the case appears under a different aspect. Emigrations from several true branches of the church, as they exist in the several countries in which the church threw off the Romish errors, and also from the various schisms that are found in those countries, combined to form our population; and that which was a true branch of the church in Europe, is such also here, whilst that which was a sect there, has not become anything better by the voyage hither. A sect here is therefore one that was such before emigration hither, or a schism from a true branch of the church in this country. But here, too, there are several bodies which deserve the name and consideration of true branches, not sects. These may be more or less pure, but none is schismatical; and in choosing to which of the various denominations we will attach ourselves, we are bound absolutely to avoid the sects, as those who unite with them become partakers of their sin; and among the true branches, we are bound to connect ourselves with that which is the purest in doctrine, not because the others are schismatical, but because we are bound to avoid false doctrine, as well as carefully to shun schismatics.

It may be necessary to repeat that we do not, when we term any denomination a sect, deny that they may still have the means of grace validly, and therefore bring men to Christ, whilst the members themselves are in Christ Jesus, and may be saved, notwithstanding their sin. Only they who see the sin and repent not, are lost, whilst they who are true believers, and yet continue in this sin of ignorance, have their "secret faults" forgiven. But they are saved "as if by fire." They are not outside of the visible church, else they would

no longer be divisions of, but apostates from the church. Their evil lies not in being beyond the stream of divine grace, so that its refreshing waters cannot reach them, but in the sin of causing and maintaining divisions, thus opposing the express command of God, and crippling the energies of his church, by dividing the means of glorifying him among various bodies—means which were intended to exert their united influence to attain one great end. Those who know their sin, are bound to shun them—to bid them God speed, as a separate organization, in nothing—in no way to countenance them—to be charitable towards them, and treat the individuals kindly, but to have no fellowship with them as a schismatic body, choosing rather to bear the blame of uncharitableness and bigotry, “falsely, for Christ’s sake,” than to abet or encourage what God has forbidden.

And yet, as the church is really one in Christ, and never can be divided in its invisible essence, so it must be our aim and prayer to unite externally, what is inwardly one, making every sacrifice, except that of our faith and its object, the truth, to edify the body of Christ, “till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.”—Eph. 4: 13. To be indifferent to the existing divisions, because God graciously brings good out of the evil, is as injurious to the cause of Christ, as to be indifferent to any moral delinquency. The church is intended to be outwardly one: she can be so only by holding the same truth, and confessing it with one mouth, without setting altar against altar; but since she is divided now, she can become one only by a firm retention, and an unwavering confession of the truth, on the part of those who possess it: for, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, the truth must at last prevail.

ARTICLE II.

[COPY-RIGHT SECURED.]

Three Lectures on Egyptian Antiquities, &c., delivered at the Stuyvesant Institute, New York, May 1856. By Dr. G. Seyffarth.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

It will not be necessary to say much by way of commending the following lectures to the attention of our readers. They were recently delivered in the city of New York, at the urgent request of a number of literary gentlemen, by the Rev. Dr. Seyffarth, late and for thirty-four years Professor of Archaeology and Philosophy at the University of Leipsic. Among scholars acquainted with the subject of these lectures, none, unless prejudiced or irretrievably committed to the contrary, will be disposed to deny, that Dr. S. was the first to unlock the mysteries of ancient Egypt, to read her written character, to interpret her astronomy, and to expound her history and reconcile it with scripture. His system has been adopted by most eminent scholars: the successor of Champollion at Paris, adopted it at once, in the place of his predecessor's, which is notoriously absurd and useless, having never led to any results except the most ludicrous. Dr. Seyffarth's system is the first by means of which any thing satisfactory has been, the only one by which any thing satisfactory can be, accomplished. Himself a profound mathematician and astronomer, he has, in his unlimited ability to turn the astronomical observations of the ancient Egyptians to most profitable account, an immense advantage over Lepsius and others, who have employed such knowledge as they possessed of Egypt's antiquities, for the purpose of utterly discrediting the Old Testament. Whilst *they* cannot calculate, and know nothing of astronomy, the calculations of Dr. Seyffarth, pronounced correct by the most eminent astronomers of Germany, serve, in the most wonderful, often startling manner, to confirm the history of the Bible. Our distinguished friend is a humble and devout christian, and all his labors and learning are employed in the service of revealed truth and of the church of God. With these few introductory observations, we leave the lectures to speak for themselves, convinced that candid inquirers and intelligent readers will at once perceive their deep interest, and the great importance and value of the learned professor's discoveries. We merely add, that those parts which, for want of time, we were unable to translate ourselves, we most carefully revised and corrected, so that we are prepared to vouch for the accuracy of the translation.

H. I. S.

After an interesting opening, which we reluctantly omit, the author proceeds:

Dr. Abbott's museum contains more than two thousand monuments of Egyptian antiquity, or objects found in Egypt: It is, therefore, not as rich as the Turin museum, the first and most important in the world, and contains one hundred thousand ancient monuments: but it possesses several specimens of nearly all Egyptian antiquities now known, and besides, a large number of such as are exceedingly rare, and even several that had previously been entirely unknown. Among these are a wooden tablet with a demotic inscription accompanied by a Greek translation, a new bilingual inscription therefore: a small Rosetta inscription: four copies of the ancient sacred writings of the Egyptians on papyrus, in hieroglyphics and in the hieratic character; several legal documents on papyrus and in the demotic character, accompanied to some extent, with a Greek index; several Greek papyri and wooden tablets; one papyrus with astronomical observations; a Gnostic seal or signet-stone with three Coptic and Greek inscriptions, being the most remarkable Abraxas [extant?]; a gold finger-ring having on it the name of Cheops, who built the great pyramid near Gizeh, in the time of David; a gold neck-chain inscribed with the name of Menes Athothis, 2781 before Christ, in the time of Phalek; several bricks from the time of Moses, with the impress of the seal of Amenophis; three mummies of Apis-bulls; two marble vessels with the number of cans and buckets which they contain marked upon them. Among the articles of porcelain, a learned gentleman of this city, Mr. Edwin Smith, who has, for many years past, devoted himself to the profound study of this branch of science, discovered the signet-ring of the high priest Ahabanuk, the same man who was the owner of the largest papyrus in the world, measuring fifty-seven feet in length, being the most complete copy of the sacred books of Egypt, and known by the name of "The Book of the Dead," in the Turin museum. Thus are antiquities, long since parted from each other, with four hundred miles between them, brought together again.

The antiquities in Dr. Abbott's museum comprise six distinct classes: historical, sacred or religious, statistical, civil, artistic, and scientific. To the historical class belong all those monuments which contain the names of Kings or of Privates: they belong to that great period which extends from Menes, the first king of Egypt, 2781 B. C., and 666

after the flood, to the reign of Constantine the great, and even still farther down, to the time of the earlier christian converts. Among other names, we find here those of the Pharaohs Menes Athothis 2700 A. C., Apophis, 2212 A. C., during whose reign Joseph was sold into Egypt: Shutmosis I, during whose reign occurred the exode of the Hebrews, 1867 A. C.; the later kings of the eighteenth and subsequent dynasties; Amenophis I., II., and IV.; Shuthmosis II., III.; Ramses, the son of the sovereign who built the celebrated Osimandym 1649 A. C.; Ramses II. and IV.; Cheops, who built the great pyramid 1100 A. C.; Shishak, Thiraka, Hophra, Psammetichus, Bocecharis, Ptolemy III. & IV., and others, of whom several are mentioned in the Old Testament. Among the things connected with particular history are a great number of historical statues and stelae, or tombstones.

Still more numerous are the sacred monuments. The most important of these are three long rolls of papyrus, respectively twenty-two, thirty-three, and thirty-six feet in length, and containing later copies of the very oldest religious books of the country. Thus also the religious ideas, the sacred usages, and the deities of the Egyptians are found represented upon several stelae and smaller rolls of papyrus. To these are to be added a very great number of statues and statuettes of the divinities, sacred animals, plants, vessels and furniture.

To the statistical antiquity belong several demotic and Greek papyri, which throw light upon the laws, courts of justice, officials, and subjects of a kindred nature.

The collection is particularly rich in objects pertaining to civil and domestic life, upon which Wilkinson wrote his excellent work entitled: "Manners and Customs of the ancient Egyptians." Here are found garments of every description and articles of ornament: such as mantles, or cloaks, ordinary clothes, aprons, boots, shoes, sandals, finger-rings, signet-stones, with or without setting, ear-rings, ear-pendants, neck-chains, bracelets and anklets, *nets*, knitted articles, embroidery, pettorali, canes. To the temple and household furniture belong door-frames, pieces of temple sculptures, bricks stamped with the royal seal, altars, vessels used for libations, censers, tables, chairs, footstools, pillows, chests, baskets, vessels and utensils of all sorts, from the largest down to the smallest, such as flagons [flasks], drinking-horns, cups, spoons, knives, forks, lamps, mirrors, combs, brushes,

brooms, colanders, stamps [or prints], wagons, weights, spindles, cords, ropes, needles, hatchets, hoes, hammers, writing materials, sistra [metallic rattles], checker-boards, toys; many kinds of fruit and grain, fig-bread, eggs, which are probably three thousand years old.

Of weapons of war there are clubs, battle-axes, daggers, bows, arrows, helmets, coats of mail, and surgical instruments.

How admirably the Egyptians understood the art, already mentioned by Herodotus, of preserving dead bodies, is here shown by several human mummies in their ornamented sarcophagi, and cerements, many separate parts of these, the mummies of Apis-bulls, crocodiles, sacred cats, Ibises, sparrow-hawks, serpents and beetles.

The higher arts and sciences of the ancient Egyptians are mirrored in nearly all the objects contained in the museum. We here see how they wrote, drew, painted and chiseled; how they formed out of metals, stones, clay or wood, all sorts of human and animal representations or images, elevated or depressed, statues and statuettes, busts and limbs. Nearly all these antiquities are, at the same time, monuments of language of the most varied description: for nearly all of them contain hieroglyphic, hieratic, demotic, coptic, Greek, cufic, Assyrian and Chinese inscriptions. To this scientific class belong also the astronomical monuments. The materials of which these have been made, are: gold, silver, bronze, iron, steel, lead, litharge, enamel, granite, basalt, marble, limestone, green stone, lapis lazuli, cornelian, agate, glass, porcelain-clay, Nile-mud, mineral colors, leather, ivory, wool, mother-of-pearl, silk threads; the sycamore, the lead pencil wood, the cedar tree, the wood of which is used for making lead pencils, the willow, gum, [gums] wax, the papyrus-plant, Byssus, flax, reed.

As respects their artistic value, it must be admitted that all these objects are far inferior to nearly all Grecian and Roman antiquity: they are, as every body will perceive, very uniform, ugly and dirty: and yet, to them that significant passage is applicable: "I am black, but *comely*, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon." The value of the entire aggregate of Egyptian antiquity consists, not in their forms, but in what they tell us and reveal to us. Each separate object is here an embodiment of truths: it is only necessary to lend a listening ear, in order to call them back to life. With every scarabæus which the inquirer takes into his hand, whole series of con-

ceptions and ideas are connected: nay, these are inseparable from that object, so long as it has not become dust. How much more emphatically is this true of entire papyrus-rolls and inscriptions that have come down to us from a period that reaches much farther back than the Old Testament, and concerning which no other nation has left us any scientific legacy. In a museum like Dr. Abbott's slumber whole series of volumes, yet to be written, and even after hundreds of years it will furnish matter for reflection, inquiry and criticism.

But it will be asked, of what use can this old rubbish be to us? This question may be answered in these words: "man liveth not by bread alone." Besides the bread that nourishes the body, human society requires a variety of intellectual nourishment, without which men would deteriorate and become like unto brute beasts. This intellectual food of the whole world, and of all futurity is, in its widest sense, called science. There is not any new, real truth, that does not exert an influence upon our purposes and actions, our pursuits and general conduct. And thus also Egyptian antiquity, which Providence has preserved during so many thousand years, and is now, at last, beginning to disclose to our view, will bear *its* fruits and contribute to the increase of those intellectual stores that furnish aliment to all the world. What scientific truths, and how many, will, in the course of time, be brought to light by means of Egyptian antiquities, no man can determine beforehand, as we have advanced no farther than the vestibule. When that Dutch boy, while playing with spectacle-glasses, discovered the achromatic telescope, nobody could yet conjecture that by means of that same telescope, thirty new planets, innumerable comets, satellites, the rings of Saturn, with the water on the inner side, the binary stars, the stars of the nebulae, &c., would afterwards be discovered. When the youth who attended to the steering of the first steam-engine, discovered the steering-wheel in consequence of fastening his line to the *lever*, it did not yet enter any one's mind that the steam-engine would, some thirty years later, propel whole fleets of ships, and trains of railway carriages. When, at Göttingen, professors Gans and Weber extended two wires from the cabinet, for the apparatus of Natural philosophy, to the Observatory, across streets and church-steeple, for the purpose of experimentally erecting a telegraph, until, struck by lightning, it scorched the dresses of the ladies who were passing beneath, nobody yet even so much as dreamed that the same

wire would, thirty years later, spread a speaking net over the whole of Europe and America. Equally important results may eventually accrue to us from the vast scientific legacy bequeathed to us by ancient Egypt; and therefore no man is justified in prematurely condemning it as worthless. Even now it has brought to light truths of the highest moment and influence. It has, for example, been very generally doubted hitherto, whether, since the days of Adam and Seth, there has been any primeval revelation, which was transmitted, through Enoch and Noah, to all the descendants of the latter. It is only the sacred books of the ancient Egyptians that have furnished the proof of this. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, it has been a subject of controversy in the christian church, whether the Hebrew text or the Greek translation, i. e., the Septuagint, contained the true chronology. But it is now ascertained that a certain Akiba, as was asserted already by Arabian writers and several church fathers, actually corrupted the Hebrew text, in order that the Messiah, whose advent was promised to take place during the sixth millennium after the creation, might be waited for fifteen hundred years longer than the appointed time. Many have hitherto believed, that the chronology of the Bible is discredited by Manetho and the Egyptian monuments. Now it is certainly known, that the two agree precisely, even to years and days, and that both place the creation and the deluge in the same years, and upon the same days. The sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt was even regarded as a myth. Now it has been positively ascertained that Manetho's shepherd kings (Hyksos) were the Hebrews, and that they established themselves in the land of Goshen, in the year 2082. Heretofore it has been maintained that the prophets and chroniclers had assigned an excess of at least four years to the Babylonish captivity. We now have proof positive, that it really lasted seventy years and a few months. It was formerly considered impossible to determine precisely the length of the cubit, which served the Hebrews as their measure in the construction of the tabernacle, and for the purposes of daily life. But now we know of a certainty, that Goliath did not measure in height, more than ten feet eight inches English, and that Og's bedstead was only seventeen feet six inches long. Since the Council of Nice, all christendom has been under the impression, that the Hebrews reckoned time, since the days of Moses, by lunar months. Now it has been demonstrated, that until after the destruction of Jerusalem,

they reckoned by a fixed solar year, and always observed Easter at the vernal equinox, our 22d of March. Nearly all historical text books at present affirm, that the chronology of the christian era is incorrect, and that Christ was announced, born, baptized, crucified and raised from the dead, in years and on days other than those specified by the evangelists. But now we know, on the contrary, that the whole christian chronology is correct, that the days which mark epochs in the [N. T.] new dispensation, are the same as those which were typically consecrated, under the old dispensation through the construction and dedication of the Tabernacle, of Solomon's, of Zerubbabel's and of Herod's temple. Our Dionysian era or reckoning commenced with the year nought: hence the current year is the 1857th after the birth of our Lord, and the current century began on the 1st of January, not of 1801, but of 1800, as is stated already in the still extant Easter-canon of Dionysius Exiguus. It has been asserted, in numberless books, that the deluge was only partial. It has now been positively ascertained that it was universal, and that it terminated on the 7th of September 3447 before Christ. It is currently maintained that our alphabet was not invented until 1500 before Christ, by the Phœnicians. Now it has been clearly proved that there have existed an alphabet and books since the time of Seth, as early as twenty-four hundred years before the deluge; that all the alphabets in the world had their origin in one and the same primitive alphabet, that our alphabet was transmitted through Noah, and so arranged as to express the conjunctions of the seven planets at the termination of the deluge, September 7th, 3447 before Christ. According to the very generally received opinion, the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, or the cuneiform character of the Persians, Medes and Assyrians, was the first of all written characters; now it is ascertained, that all these and similar written characters have the Noachian alphabet of twenty-five letters for their basis. Hitherto a great number of Indomaniacs have maintained, that the original language had been the Indogermanic, a sort of sanscrit. Now it is known that all the languages in the world are derived from the Hebrew original language, as the very names of the antediluvian letters among the different nations, and the language of the ancient Egyptians prove. According to Letronne and others, our zodiac had its origin only five hundred years A. C. Now we know that it is as old as the human race, and that it passed, through Noah, to all the nations of

his posterity. All the world has hitherto believed, that the ancient nations worshiped nothing but dumb idols, stars, animals, plants and the like. Now we know, that they all had more or less faithfully preserved the original revelations; that next to the Creator of all things, they worshiped his servants, more exalted creatures intermediate between God and man, and that they lapsed only in later times into downright idolatry. The seven Cabiri, chief Gods of all the ancient nations, were not symbols of deified powers of nature, but emblems of the seven planets, which were thought to be the bodies of the seven archangels. The twelve superior gods of all the ancient nations had reference to the twelve constellations of the zodiac, these being regarded as the abodes, or the bodies of the second class of those who ministered to the gods. Hitherto it has been supposed, that the earliest and innumerable astronomical observations of the ancient Egyptians, referred to already by Diodorus Siculus, had utterly disappeared from the sphere of human knowledge. Now we know that several hundreds of them, extending down to the Roman emperors, and back to Menes, 2781 A. C., have been preserved upon the pyramids, in temples, on sarcophagi, stelae and papyrus-rolls. It is only by means of these observations of conjunctions, mathematically accurate and reliable, instituted upon the occurrence of important events, and at the birth of Pharaohs, that, because none of these conjunctions can occur twice in history, and similar ones only after intervals of twenty-one hundred and forty-six years, the entire history of Egypt has been reduced to order. The first twelve dynasties of Manetho, and several others, reigned not in succession, but simultaneously in different provinces. Fourteen conjunctions prove that Menes did not take possession of Mizraim, until 2781 A. C., during the reign of Phalek, six hundred and sixty-six years after the deluge. Moses, whose conjunction is mentioned by Josephus, by the Rabbis, and even in the Old Testament, was born under the seventeenth dynasty, 1948 A. C. It has heretofore been believed, that the Greeks never observed conjunctions, or at least preserved no record of them; now a great number of them, going back to the year 778 A. C., expressed precisely like those of the Egyptians, and preserved upon their temples, statues, Etrurian vases, and in the works of authors, have come to light; and thus we are enabled to determine the dates of the events connected with

them, with mathematical certainty. Hitherto it was the opinion of all the world, that the Greeks reckoned by lunar months: now it is manifest, that they had accurately determined solar months, which corresponded with those of the Hebrews and other nations, and by means of which the dates occurring in Grecian history can be determined to the very day. In times past, men believed that the Romans had never observed planetary conjunctions. It is now ascertained that the lectisternia of Livy; the arae, candelabra, lamps, temple-friezes, and walls in Pompeii, contain such conjunctions, stated in the same manner as by the Egyptians: and thus the dates of all the events of Roman history are fixed with more than historical certainty. Hitherto the whole christian and enlightened world has, since the publication, in 1627, of Petav's *doctrina temporum*, been convinced that his chronology and history of the Romans, Greeks, Persians and other nations, as repeated in millions of books, even in Clinton's *Fasti Hellinici et Romani*, were correct. Now it is ascertained that Petav and his copiers have incorrectly inserted the Consules suffecti 47 and 78 after the birth of Christ, and have thus antedated the whole Roman and Grecian history, down to Titus, by one and two years. The assassination of Cæsar occurred, not 44, but 42 A. C., and the Olympiads began, not 776, but 774 A. C. Hitherto all men believed that the historical Canon of Ptolemy was infallible, because Babylonian observations of eclipses of the moon were connected with certain years in the reigns of his sovereigns: it is now-known for certain, that Ptolemy fixed these eclipses only by means of calculations, and that, in almost every instance, he calculated wrong ones. And in this connection it has been demonstrated, that all our lunar tables, as was shown already by the total eclipse of the sun in Germany, 1851, are constructed upon the false statements of Ptolemy, hence that they assume, as their basis, an incorrect mean motion of the moon and of the moon's nodes; as also a wrong coefficient of the secular equation, and that, therefore, they require to be rectified throughout. These corrections can be easily made by means of the total eclipses of the sun, found in the history of Rome, Greece and other nations. The same is to be said of our planetary tables hitherto in use, which are also based upon the statements of Ptolemy. For in Egypt there has been found a vast number of the recorded observations of the position of planets, many of which extend back three thousand years earlier than Ptolemy's day,

and serve for the correction of our tables. Hitherto it has been a universally received opinion, that those ages of the Romans, the Greeks, the Parsees, and others, in which Uranus, Saturn, or Jupiter reigns, were mere fables. Now it has become manifest that these ages of the world were periods of twenty-one hundred and forty-six years, during which the equinoctial point runs exactly through a sign of the zodiac. At the beginning of each-one of these ages, the ancients observed and recorded the places of the planets, and thus it has been ascertained that the first age of the world began 5871 A. C., on the 10th of May, according to the Julian reckoning, on a Saturday, being at the same time the vernal equinox. The day on which Christ rose from the dead was the same on which the creation of the world was completed. Thus we have a confirmation of the true chronology of the Bible, which begins with the Sabbath of the vernal equinox, 5871 A. C. Thirty years ago half the world believed that the lesser zodiac of Dendera, at Paris, was really, as calculations had been made to prove, seventeen thousand years old, and that the creation and the deluge were mere fictions. Now we know that upon that stone the planetary conjunction that occurred at the birth of Nero, 37 P. C., is inscribed. These are some of the scientific results which Egyptian antiquity has already produced, and is likely to continue to bring to light. And surely no one who examines these Egyptian antiquities will, upon leaving the museum, now give his assent to the words which some former visiter wrote in Dr. Abbott's register: "The greatest humbug;" but will, in his heart, join in the words of Solomon, "they are black, but very comely, ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar."

I. THE PAPYRI.

The first place in Dr. Abbott's museum is due to the seventeen papyrus-rolls which it contains. How were these rolls, from one to twenty-two, twenty-three and thirty-six feet in length, produced? When we compare our fine, smooth white paper, with this yellow, ugly, wrinkled rag, we are apt to smile in pity; and yet, had the Egyptians written on our beautiful paper, not one line of their literature would have attained the age of four thousand years; nay, there would, perhaps, be very little left of the entire literature of the Greeks and Romans. These rolls of papyrus, then: the same as those which Vesuvius buried, for seventeen hundred

years, in Herculaneum, beneath ashes and streams of lava; those rolls, on which Cicero's and Plato's letters were traced, and which have preserved for us the most ancient manuscript copies of the Old and New Testaments, and of the Gothic translation of the Bible; on which Moses, thirty-seven hundred years ago, inscribed the law, and the prophets recorded the word of God; how were they produced?

The aquatic plant, called papyrus, i. e., the royal or noble plant, has now entirely disappeared from Egypt, and is found only in Sicily, Syria, and in botanic gardens. From a root of the thickness of an arm, shoot up long stalks, from two to four inches thick, which grow to a height of from eight to sixteen feet. The head or crown of this straight, trilateral shaft, which tapers but slightly toward the top, is formed by a great number of short branches, from the upper part of each of which three long and very narrow leaves are suspended. Underneath the thin green rind or shell, there is, from the root to the crown, a white pith, through which run threads or fibres resembling those of wood [or, pierced longitudinally by woody fibres]: this pith, which resembles that of several trees, especially of the elder, is the material of which the paper of the ancients was prepared. When we examine an Egyptian papyrus, by holding it against the light, we discover that the woody fibres run horizontally as well as vertically, and that the two layers are cemented together by means of gum. In order to produce a roll of papyrus, the following processes were found necessary: First, the green rind or bark of several stalks was peeled off: thereupon the stalks were cut into cylinders of equal length, and these were then, by means of a very sharp knife, divided into very thin strips, slices or ribbons. Of these strips a number were now laid vertically against each other, so that each overlapped the other by the twelfth part of an inch. After this first layer had been moistened with gum-water, another layer of such strips was, in like manner, laid horizontally across it, and then both layers were pressed, dried and polished [glazed]. Thus one leaf of paper was completed. By joining together several leaves, and uniting their edges with gum, a roll of papyrus, or what *we* would call a book, is produced, of any required length. It would appear that Pliny never saw the papyrus plant, which accounts for his incorrect description of the paper of the ancients. That I have correctly described the process, will become evident upon the examination of any papyrus, and I have placed this beyond all doubt, by myself

producing, from papyrus stalks obtained in botanical gardens, a great number of papyri exactly like the ancient Egyptian, and those found in Herculaneum. No paper in the world is as durable as this: in many museums we find rolls that are more than three thousand years old, and which can still be unrolled and rolled up without the least injury.

The ink of the Egyptians was not made of the [black precipitate produced by the union of gallic acid and iron, and called the] gallate of iron, which would have turned yellow very soon: it was Indian ink; pulverized charcoal mixed with gum: hence their writing has remained black and glossy down to the present day. The titles, as well as the first words of chapters, were written with red ink; as is still the case among the Copts, the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and among the Aethiopians. The black ink was prepared out of the bark of the papyrus plant, which, owing to the great quantity of siliceous earth which it contains, yields an excellent black for writing.

For the purpose of writing, or rather drawing, letters, the Egyptians did not make use of goose-quills, steel or reed pens, but of the branches mentioned above as forming the crown of the papyrus plant. These also contain pith and many of the woody fibres before spoken of: by sharpening one of these at one end, it was formed into a pencil or brush, which did not, however, take up much ink, so that, as the written lines plainly show, it was necessary to dip into it very often. Thus the remarkable papyrus plant alone furnished every thing which the Egyptians required for the ordinary purposes of writing.

The manner in which their writing materials were arranged is shown by several specimens in Dr. Abbott's museum. They consist of tablets of wood, furnished with two cavities, which contained the black and the red ink, and with a little sliding drawer, in which the small papyrus branches used for writing were kept. Similar apparatuses for writing are also found, made of marble or ivory. These were worn by the sacred writers, in the girdle, just as the orientals who are able to write, still carry their writing materials about with them in the girdle.

Dr. Abbott's Egyptian papyri are to be distinguished under the three heads of Hieroglyphic, Hieratic and Demotic or enchorial writings. The word hieroglyphics denotes the sacred character, for the word is formed of *ιερός* sacred, and *γραφειν* to engrave. Hieratic is derived from the word *ιερεὺς*.

priest, and hence the hieratic character denotes that used in ordinary by the priests. Demotic, derived from the root *δημος*, people, designates the characters in use among the common people. This same character the rosetta stone designates as the enchorial, from the Greek *ἐγχώριος*, indigenous, national. These three different characters, or modes of writing grew, the one out of the other. The hieroglyphic is the most ancient; from it proceeded the hieratic, by abbreviating the signs, because it required too much time to draw, every time, the entire figures. Indeed, the hieratic papyri and inscriptions do not reach back as far as the hieroglyphic. The demotic character is the hieratic abbreviated and simplified to the utmost, because, as in the former instance, the hieratic required too much time and labor. The demotic writings do not reach farther back than the sixth century A. C. In what manner the hieroglyphic signs were abbreviated into the hieratic, and then into the demotic, will be readily perceived upon comparing the same words written in hieroglyphics, in the hieratic and in the demotic character. All the three characters are written from the right to the left, as were the letters of nearly all the nations of antiquity. Only the hieroglyphics were, for the sake of symmetry, sometimes written also in the opposite direction.

II. THE KEY TO THE HIEROGLYPHICS.

In what manner the ancient Egyptians expressed their conceptions and thoughts in these three written characters: in what manner we are to proceed in order to discover anew the laws according to which the ancient Egyptians expressed conceptions and thoughts: and what is the true key to the hieroglyphics? This is a question, upon the solution of which depends the restoration to life of the entire and immeasurable literature of the ancient Egyptians, the oldest, and perhaps the most important literature of the ancient world. With the introduction of the Greek language and written characters in the time of Alexander the Great, and especially since the translation of the Old and New Testaments into the Coptic, the art of reading hieroglyphics was gradually lost. The last instance of a hieroglyphic translation occurred in the reign of Augustus. This emperor caused the large obelisk, which, bearing an inscription of twelve long hieroglyphic lines, has since been erected again at the porta del popolo, to be brought to Rome; and the inscriptions upon it were, as we read in Ammianus Marcellinus, translated into Greek by

an Egyptian priest named Hermapion. Since that time, however, the key to the hieroglyphics has been, in some degree, preserved and transmitted to us, in the new-fashioned hieroglyphics, in the so-called Rebus. These Rebus express syllables by means of pictures, and are still called hieroglyphics. The true key to the hieroglyphics would, probably, have never been discovered again, had not several hieroglyphic inscriptions, accompanied with a Greek translation, been found from time to time. First, Bonaparte found, in 1799, the Rosetta stone, with hieroglyphic and demotic text, besides a Greek translation: this was not published until 1812. In 1844, Prof. Spohn, at Leipzig, my instructor, and Kosegarten, discovered the Greek translation of a demotic papyrus in Berlin. In the year 1826, I found at Turin the original, but unfortunately incomplete, of Manetho's work on Egyptian history; and in the same year, at Rome, the obelisk translated by Hermapion. In 1848 I found the translation of the ancient table of Abydos, preserved by Eratosthenes. In 1849 Lepsius published six inscriptions containing the names of the thirty-six decani (wardens of the zodiac), known from Greek and Roman authors, and written in different ways; according to Champollion's system these could not be read at all. In 1849 Brugsch discovered the gate of Philae, with its translation on the Rosetta stone. In 1855 I found the translation of the table of Karnak in the fragments which we possess of Eratosthenes and Manetho. To these must be added several old Egyptian papyrus rolls, and mummy chests, with Greek translations of some proper names, to be found at Turin, Berlin, Leyden, St. Petersburg, in Dr. Abbott's museum, and in other collections. By means of these numerous bilingual inscriptions, the true key to the hieroglyphics, which had been sought after during eighteen hundred years, was again brought to light. The key to the hieroglyphics is the fundamental law of the Egyptian written character, an acquaintance with which law will enable any man to read whatever text he pleases, and to find the meaning which the writer intended to convey.

The first question that here presents itself is, in what language did the ancient Egyptians write? This was, of course, the Coptic; for the Copts are the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and Coptus is simply the word *Aegyptus*, minus the initial syllable *ae*, which was dropped in later times. The later Coptic must, however, have differed somewhat from the ancient Coptic, which is two thousand years older; for no

language remains unchanged during a period of two thousand years. Now, it has been ascertained, that the Coptic was far more nearly related to the ancient Hebrew, or Chaldee, than to any other language in the world: that a great many grammatical forms, and nearly all Coptic roots are derived from the Chaldee. This is not surprising; for there was an original language; and this was not, as the Indomaniacs maintain, the modern and highly cultivated Sanscrit, but, as can be easily proved, the Hebrew, which bears so unmistakably the stamp of antiquity. Experience has shown, that a nation will, in the progress of centuries, make but few and unimportant changes in its original language, if it continues to inhabit the same country, under the same circumstances, within the same surroundings. Now we know that with Abraham, eleven hundred and fifty years after the flood, four hundred and eighty-four years after Phalek, during whose life the Egyptians and all the other ancient nations emigrated from Babylonia, 2781 A. C., the Hebrews left their original place of abode: the Abrahamidae spoke Hebrew, and consequently this same language must have been indigenous in Chaldea. But as Menes also came from Chaldea, only four hundred and eighty-four years before Abraham, the ancient Egyptian must be most intimately related to the Hebrew. Furthermore, it is known that all the ancient languages, not only the Semitic, but also the Japhetic, have, in numberless forms and roots, a close affinity to the Hebrew: among these ancient languages are the Greek, the German, the Sanscrit, the Parsee and others. From this it follows again, that the original language was the ancient Chaldee. The same is proved by the names of the letters. For all the alphabets in the world are derived from one original alphabet; and this was [preserved and] handed down by Noah. The Hebraeo-Chaldee letters are pictures with Hebrew names. - Aleph is the Hebrew name of the bull; and of this animal the letter Aleph, the Alpha of the Greeks, is the picture, and so on. The same names of the letters we find more or less distinctly preserved among such ancient nations even as differ most from each other: consequently their original language also must have been the Chaldee. Had not the Chaldee been the mother of the Greek language, the Greeks would certainly not have designated their letters by foreign, Chaldaic, entirely unintelligible names. Lastly, the alphabet of Noah, arranged at the time of the deluge, contains within itself, as has come to light twenty years ago, an inscription; and this inscription

is Hebrew. In short, the language of the ancient Egyptians was primarily connected with the Chaldaic original language. But this ancient Coptic language was far from differing as much from the later Coptic, as does the ancient Greek from the modern Greek, the Latin from the Italian.

But our next inquiry now is, what is the first principle, the fundamental law, which constitutes the key to the entire literature of the ancient Egyptians? This key is so simple, that it is a matter of surprise, how it could have remained concealed for eighteen hundred years; but it is a common experience, that the world seeks afar off what is close at hand, and often regards its most unlikely conclusions as the most probable. Let us look at the subject for a moment.

In the immense mass of inscriptions and papyri, there occur not more than six hundred and thirty different hieroglyphics. Now, if with each figure the Egyptians had expressed one whole word, as is generally believed even now, they would have known and employed, within three thousand years, not more than six hundred and thirty words. And surely no sane man will believe this of a people to whom Homer, Plato, and Herodotus assign so high a rank. They certainly must have had at least as many conceptions or ideas as the Copts and the Hebrews, and therefore at least six thousand words.

Now if, in order to express symbolically six thousand words, the Egyptians had assigned to each hieroglyph ten distinct meanings, they would never have been able to understand their own writings a second time. A hieroglyphic inscription of such a character, and consisting of two hundred figures, would be susceptible of twenty thousand different translations; and yet Hermapion was able to translate for Augustus an obelisk seventeen hundred years old, and that in precisely the same manner in which the Rosetta inscription has been translated. There must have been, therefore, a definite, permanent and simple key. The hieroglyphic character cannot have been symbolical.

All antiquity, as, for instance, Josephus, the Koran, the New Testament, the Hindoos, the Chaldeans, the Phoenicians, and others, testify that within the twenty-four hundred and twenty-four years from Adam to Noah, alphabets and books existed, and that the sciences originated with Seth. The same nations, and to specify persons, we may name Sanchoiathion, Berosus, and others, expressly affirm that the

original alphabet was handed down and newly arranged by Noah. Now, if the Egyptians had cast away this glorious invention of a simple alphabet, in order to introduce a system of such a Cimmerian symbolic writing, they would have taken an insane backward stride, and put nonsense in the place of sense.

The original alphabet, transmitted by Noah, comprised, as a comparison of all the ancient alphabets shows, twenty-five letters with seven vowels, and began with a. b. c. and so on. The same alphabet formed, as Plutarch and others affirm, the basis of the hieroglyphics; for the ancient Egyptians also had only twenty-five letters, inclusively of seven vowels, and their alphabet began with a, precisely as the Hebrew, the Greek, the Latin, the East Indian, and others, in short, all the alphabets of antiquity. Hence, the hieroglyphics must also have had an alphabet of twenty-five letters for their basis.

If we should assume that the Egyptians had at one time employed their six hundred and thirty hieroglyphics symbolically, as representing words, at another literally, as letters, the absurdity of their method of writing would be reduced by one half; but then again, we cannot comprehend why they should have mixed up together two entirely different systems, and devised, in the place of a clear and reliable method, one utterly obscure and uncertain. Add to this that the symbolical interpretation of the hieroglyphics yields us nothing but the greatest nonsense. From the inscription on the Rosetta-stone, and the other bilingual inscriptions, we have ascertained what ideas or conceptions are expressed by certain hieroglyphics. The hatchet, for example, denoted God. But how can a hatchet, which might, at the utmost, perhaps have symbolically expressed the act of hewing or splitting, in any intelligible manner denote God. The simple minded Egyptians probably conceived their Osiris to be a wood-cutter or a butcher. We learn from the Rosetta inscription, that the Egyptians designated a burnt offering by a drop-bucket. In all likelihood, therefore, the water of the Nile possessed at that time the properties of fire, and served for burning. The Egyptians expressed the number 10,000 by means of the drawing of a finger: doubtless because, at that time, man possessed, upon his hands and feet, ten thousand fingers, which have gradually dropped off.

When, finally, we examine the written characters of other ancient nations, we find that their method of writing was syllabic. The written signs of the Chinese, numbering from

forty thousand to eighty thousand, were, as I learned from Gützlaff, who understood Chinese affairs better than any other European, not symbolic, but abbreviated syllabic hieroglyphics. Thus, for example, they still designate Cassel by means of two pictures, of which the first was called Cas, the second, Sel. In like manner the groups of cuneiform characters employed by the Medes, the Assyrians, and the Babylonians, denoted syllables, as has been shown elsewhere, and fully confirmed by Rawlinson. Surely then the Egyptians might also, with the aid of the ancient twenty-five articulate sounds, have invented a method of syllabic writing; and that such is the case, has now been fully ascertained. An invention of this kind was, moreover, the most simple, and the most likely to suggest itself. In the Noachian alphabet each pictured letter represents the sound with which the name of the picture commences. The letter Beth is the picture of a bushel-measure, which the Hebrews called Bath: it therefore stands for B, because the name of the picture begins with that consonant. And now, in order to obtain for the temple walls, obelisks, stelae, and the purposes of writing in general, a shorter written character, it was determined to represent, by the picture of the measure called Bath, both the consonants which the name of that measure contains, and therefore to adopt the picture of the Bath measure to designate the syllable Bt [Bth?]; the same remarks are applicable to many other Hebrew pictures.

The key to the hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, so long sought after, is then, briefly, this: *It is the general principle that every hieroglyphic represents the consonants contained in the name of the object of which the hieroglyphic is a picture*: as in Hebrew and in other Semitic languages, the vowels were commonly left out of the account. And thus, then, the picture of the hatchet, in Coptic *hater*, represented the word God, *htr*, not symbolically, but because the two words contained the same consonants, *htr*. Therefore, also the well-bucket, *klil*, represented the word burnt-offering, *kalil*, not symbolically, but because both words were formed by the same consonants. Therefore the finger, *tba*, did not, in a fanciful manner, denote the number 10,000, *tba*, but because the same consonants were the basis of both words. The same is true of all the other six hundred and thirty hieroglyphics of the ancient Egyptians. Sometimes combinations of two or three consonants were required, for which no picture representing these consonants, thus combined, could

be found, and in such cases the word was taken in an alphabetic character; each of its consonants was expressed by a picture, the name of which began with that sound which it was required to express: this was especially the case in respect of many proper names. Thus in the name, Ptolemy, the *P* is represented by the picture of the Bath measure, because the name of this measure began with *P* or *B*. Yet even in the case of proper names, syllabic hieroglyphics were often used. Thus the Rosetta inscription expresses, by means of the gridiron, *kerā*, the syllable *Gr.* in *Graikos*, (*Graecus*.)

There is not any hieroglyphic which denotes symbolically any idea, or conception, or word: there is not an inscription in existence that has a single symbolical sign. The explanation of hieroglyphic inscriptions and papyri, depends no longer upon fanciful conjectures, in the employment of which every man would fall upon a different meaning; but it is subject, like every other oriental text, to philological laws. Even the figures or pictures employed by the Egyptians to represent their gods, are not to be explained symbolically, but grammatically. Who is able to tell with what rational design the Egyptians represented their Horus as a human being with the head of a sparrow-hawk? How could they represent God by a sparrow-hawk, without being laughed at by every schoolboy? To explain this symbolically, is impossible, but there is no difficulty in explaining it grammatically. The sparrow-hawk was called *hor*, in the old Egyptian *kor*, and therefore syllabically denoted *kur*, *κύριος* the Lord. The same is true of all the other figures by means of which the Egyptians represented their gods and their insignia.

But the question will be asked, how can it be proved that this syllabic principle furnishes the true key to the entire literature of the ancient Egyptians? We prove this, in the first place, by the fact, that all students of Egyptian antiquities have now, more or less avowedly, accepted this principle; among these we may name particularly Champollion, Salvolini, Birch, Bunsen, Lepsius, De Rouge, Brugsch, Uhlemann, and others. Truth is so mighty, that sooner or later it must prevail. But again, by means of this principle, a great number of proper names which Greek authors had made known to us, have been recovered and read. Moreover, the same principle has enabled us, at last, to decipher all bilingual inscriptions, such as that of the Rosetta stone, of Hermapion's obelisk, the gate of Philae, the tables of Abydos and Kar-

nak, &c. To this we may add the inductive proof, that a grammar of hieroglyphics must be correct, if it enables us to translate, with logical correctness, entire and extensive written productions. With the aid of my grammar, entire books, and chapters, and inscriptions have been translated, word for word, from beginning to end. Wherever it has been applied, the text has yielded connected and rational thoughts, which, had the principle been incorrect, would never have been the case. Lastly, my grammar had already been sometime published, when Lepsius made public more than one hundred proper names of the said Decani; and now it was found that the hieroglyphics which occur in these proper names, the pronunciation of which names had been transmitted to us by Firmicus, Origen, and others, formed syllables, and conveyed precisely the sounds which had previously been ascribed to them in my grammar. It is needless to adduce any further evidence.

However, the question may still arise, what has become of the celebrated hieroglyphic system of Dr. Young, and that of Champollion? Dr. Young was the first man who threw any light whatever into the darkness which had, for eighteen hundred years, enveloped the hieroglyphics. It is true that the Jesuit, Kircher, had before him published, in Rome, seven folio volumes upon the hieroglyphics, and translated entire obelisks; but in all those seven volumes there is not a solitary word of truth. He regarded each hieroglyphic as one word, ascribed to each figure ten distinct significations, employing it at one time as a substantive, at another as a verb, now as an adjective, and again as an adverb. In this way he made one group to yield the following meaning: "The beneficent power of procreation, mighty through the upper and the lower lord, promotes the influx of the sacred fluid, which comes from above, Saturn, the regulator of rapidly flying time; and the beneficent deity increases the fertility of the fields, exerting its influence upon human nature." Now we know that this same group reads and signifies neither more nor less than: *Cæsar Domitianus*. Dr. Young, therefore, first found, in 1819, on the Rosetta stone, the name *Ptolemaeus*: compared it with that of *Arsinoë* and *Berenice*, and thus discovered the first phonetic signs, and the first articles for a lexicon of hieroglyphics. But of the hieroglyphic letters which Dr. Young was supposed to have discovered, only nine subsequently proved to be correct. He assigned to his hieroglyphics one consonant, with one or two

vowels: by the lion, for example, he conceived the sounds *ole* to be represented. All hieroglyphics not occurring in proper names, he regarded, like Kircher, as symbolic; but he justly considered several as together constituting one word. According to him, house, mouth and feet, together denoted symbolically, bearing respect; hence, Epiphanes (illustrious). At the same time, Champollion had published a book for the purpose of proving that the hieroglyphics contained nothing whatsoever of an alphabetic nature. But he no sooner heard of Dr. Young's discovery, than he bought in again, as quickly as possible, the copies of his book, and published, in 1821, his *Lettre à M. Dacier*, in which he deciphered a great many other names of kings, and made additions to the alphabet of Dr. Young, without even once alluding to him. This was the first literary furtum of the French savant, to say nothing of his later ones. On the other hand, Champollion made the discovery that the phonetic hieroglyphics do not express a consonant accompanied with vowels, but only a consonant or vowel, and that the one with which, as in Hebrew, the name of the hieroglyphic begins. Thus, then, the lion, being called Laboi, was made to express the sound or letter *l*, and not *ole*. This was, however, only partially true; for in the same manner as in our language, sundry objects and hieroglyphics had several names, so that the same hieroglyphic does not, in every instance, express the same sound, as is the case in Hebrew.

Soon after appeared, in 1826, my *Rudimenta hieroglyphices*, in which it was, for the first time, shown that no hieroglyphic writing or text whatever, contained any symbolic hieroglyphics, and that many figures denote two consonants at the same time, and are therefore to be sounded syllabically.

Before this, however, in 1824, Champollion's *Precis du Systeme hieroglyphique* appeared, and lastly, in 1836, his comprehensive *Grammaire and Dictionnaire*, which completed Champollion's system. All the world believed that this contained the key to the hieroglyphics, and that any body would be able, by means of it, to read entire works of the ancient Egyptians.

But it all amounted to nothing. After the world had, for twenty-one whole years, made laborious and fruitless efforts to turn this system to practical account, Bunsen acknowledged, in 1845, as well as Lepsius and Birch: "We declare, as decidedly, that there is not a man alive, who could read and explain [according to Champollion's system] any whole sec-

tion of the Book of the Dead, much less a historical papyrus." And why not? All the rules laid down by Champollion proved to be wrong. All his efforts were made in a wrong direction. His entire system was based upon hypotheses that contradict history, and upon the deciphering of very short sentences, severed from their connexion, which, precisely because they were too short and disconnected, are susceptible of a hundred different explanations. Of such his whole grammar is full. Had Champollion endeavored, first of all, to decipher the Rosetta inscription and entire hieroglyphic texts, from beginning to end, he would have propounded an entirely different system.

In the first instance, Champollion taught, that the half of every hieroglyphic inscription consisted of symbolic signs; and maintained that the hieroglyphic preceded the alphabetical writing, without for a moment considering, that even before the deluge there had been an alphabet and books, that the Egyptians possessed an alphabet of twenty-five letters, including seven vowels, and that their first letter was *A*; and that their whole system of writing must have been based upon Noah's alphabet. Moreover, his explanation of the symbolic hieroglyphics was so ingenious, as to be, I acknowledge it, quite beyond my comprehension. Thus, according to Champollion, the Egyptians expressed the word thirst by means of waves and a calf. Now we know indeed, that calves are always thirsty; but it was never known that in Egypt they had much thirst for waves. According to Champollion, the intransitive verb was denoted by two feet represented as moving forward. According to our logic, we would rather conclude that two feet in motion denoted the transitive, and not the intransitive form of the verb. In fact, however, these denoted nothing more than the participle *et*, as also in the Coptic, because the feet expressed the consonant *t*. Champollion, as well as Kircher, very ingeniously translated all the agnomina of the kings symbolically: e. g. *Soleil*, *garden de la verite*. Unfortunately, however, the Greek translations of the Flaminian Obelisk, and of the tables of Abydos and Karnak, came subsequently to light; and then it was discovered that of the hundred ingenious translations of Champollion, not a single one was correct: instead of *Soleil*, *garden de la verite*, *Hermapion* read *Ramses*: instead of *ami de Phtha Nubnubei*, *Diodurus Siculus* read *Osimandya*. In short, Champollion was unable to allege a single well founded reason, why the Egyptians should have expressed

certain words symbolically, by means of certain hieroglyphics: why, e. g., the forehead should logically denote the number 10; a ball of yarn, 100; the lotus-leaf, 1000; the finger, 10,000; the hatchet, a God; or the well-bucket, a burnt-offering, and so on.

The second fundamental law of Champollion's system runs thus: you must not ascribe to any hieroglyphic a syllabic value or meaning. Although the opposite of this had been demonstrated, as early as 1826, in my *Rudimenta hieroglyphices*, Champollion persisted in reasserting this error in all his subsequent works. Even in his grammar, which was published in 1836, after his death, the same law is repeated, whilst not one table with syllabic hieroglyphics is given in his work. And thus Champollion had effectually deprived himself, and all his disciples, of every means of correctly translating the Rosetta inscription, or any other text; for, in general, every hieroglyphic figure denotes a syllable of two or three consonants. In a text of five hundred hieroglyphics, four hundred syllabic signs are contained.

Not less pernicious was the influence of Champollion's third fundamental law; that the Egyptians regarded a picture as underlying determinatively the hieroglyphic groups, in order to indicate symbolically to what class of things the word belongs which precedes the determinative. This principle gave rise to the most luxuriant absurdity. For example, in the group consisting of a throne, an eye and a man, it is asserted that the throne denotes dominion, the eye, providence, and both together, according to some unknown logic, Osiris, the most holy God. With this the Egyptians connected the determinative, man. But any sensible man will naturally demand to know, whether the Creator of all things belongs to the class of human beings? Egypt was represented by the reed, we are told; and with this the plan of a city was conjoined as the determinative. But, did Egypt belong to the class of cities, or not rather to that of countries? The hieroglyphic letters *hpi*, form the word *hopi*, serpent; but also the word *hepi*, house. The determinative of this group is the picture of a snake; Champollion translated this group, and could not help translating it, serpent or snake. The entire passage, comprising that group, was thus rendered by Champollion: "There is a serpent thirty cubits in length, fifteen cubits broad, and four cubits thick." What has become of this prodigy, which still existed in the time of the ancient Egyptians; a serpent thirty cubits by fifteen, and

only four cubits thick? Perhaps this was an antediluvian leech, or Dr. Koch's gigantic lizard, only that it was ten cubits broad: or perhaps, even, it was our celebrated sea-serpent, measuring fifteen cubits in breadth. However, that hieroglyphic group also denotes house, *hepi*; and its determinative, serpent, was not symbolical, but syllabic, *hp*; and therefore, once again, for the sake of perspicuity, syllabically expresses the preceding consonants *hp*. Hence the sense of the passage was the following: "There is a house thirty cubits long, fifteen cubits wide, and four cubits high; this is the habitation of the departed one in the land of the blessed." In short, there are no symbolical, but only phonetic determinatives; and whoever translates inscriptions according to Champollion's symbolical determinatives, can produce nothing but nonsense. Even those determinatives which apparently represent the same objects, preceded by their names, phonetically written, are elsewhere used to designate syllabically, words of an entirely different signification, or are separate words. Thus, for example, the word *on*, sun, is followed by the plan of a city, in order to form the compound word Heliopolis, a city of the sun; for the city plan, *baki*, signifies city, and together with the preceding *on*, a sun, the compound term, city of the sun. This same plan of a city is employed to determine *Km*, Egypt, in order to form the word land of Egypt; for the city plan *bk*, is syllabically equivalent to *baki*, land, and therefore *km bk* conjointly, denote the land of Egypt.

Lastly, Champollion's system teaches the doctrine that every hieroglyphic inscription contains a multitude of abbreviations. Instead of *suten*, king, the Egyptians, as Champollion says, often put only *s*; in lieu of *nuter* only *n*; in lieu of *kr* only *k*; in lieu of *ouch* only *o*; instead of *pt* only *p*, &c., &c. How can any man conceive of such a method of writing, designed to be intelligible to all men? In every passage of five hundred hieroglyphics, we are required, in four hundred instances, to regard one letter as representing two or three. How would it then have been possible to understand a single line in the sense which the writer intended to convey? Fifty years ago the custom was in vogue in Germany, of adding the letters u. a. w. g. (the favor of an answer is requested) at the bottom of invitation cards, which provoked a playwright to write an entire comedy, in order to exhibit the multiplicity of senses in which the initials in ques-

tion may be taken, in a ridiculous light. Every one interpreted these abbreviations according to his fancy; the gourmands read them, "there will be drinking of choice Hungarian wines:" the young ladies insisted that they meant, "and in the evening there will be dancing." Had Champollion not been stricken with blindness, he would have observed, as early as 1824, that those isolated hieroglyphics, which are expressive of entire words, were no abbreviations, but were to be pronounced syllabically, and that they served to express the sounds contained in their names, and hence phonetically entire words, the same words which were sometimes written alphabetically.

From this system of Champollion, that of the Messrs. Lepsius, Birch and Bunsen differs in only one particular. It is the opinion of these gentlemen, that those isolated hieroglyphics which are expressive of entire words, were not always abbreviations of the same groups, but sometimes abbreviations of entirely different words. They explained the matter thus: In the earliest times the Egyptian words were all expressed symbolically, according to some undiscovered principle, by means of two or three hieroglyphic signs. Subsequently the second and the third hieroglyphic was omitted, and the first was taken in the sense of the original group. At a still later period, this remaining hieroglyphic was besides used to express syllabically other and entirely different words. Surely this is treating the sound common sense of mankind with contempt! Who can for a moment reconcile his mind to a system presenting such a mass of confusion? There was, at least, something to be said in favor of Champollion's system. For the Egyptians really did express many words invariably by the same hieroglyphics, partly because they selected such figures, of which the names themselves contained the vowels of the words to be expressed, and partly for the purpose of establishing a logical connection between the words to be expressed, and the figures employed to express them. Thus, for example, the word *Kam*, Egypt, was not denoted by the lion's paw, which was read *Kome*, and thus also contains the sound *km*, but by the reed *kam*, because the latter contained the same vowel, and is, moreover, logically related to Egypt, which abounds in reeds. Thus then, Champollion's doctrine, although incorrect, had at least something in its favor. For we can conceive of such a thing as that the Egyptians had abbreviated certain words, because these words invariably began with the same sign, and were generally

known. But that doctrine which exhibits a confusion worse confounded, and according to which, a hieroglyphic denotes all the words which begin with the same hieroglyphic, is so absurd, that it is unnecessary to waste another word upon it.

We must, however, guard against the assumption, that this mixed system leads to the same results as the syllabic. For if we look for the names belonging to the six hundred and thirty hieroglyphics, we perceive at once what consonants each of them contained, and consequently, also what words were expressed by each one of them. But according to the mixed system, it would first of all be necessary to ascertain in what manner each word was, in the earliest days, symbolically expressed by several signs, and what hieroglyphics originally lay back of any particular figure, in order to ascertain its syllabic signification in places where it expresses an entire word. The Egyptians, however, have, under no circumstances, written in this manner, so that it is impossible to find the syllabic signification of all the hieroglyphics by such a process. And yet men like Lepsius and Birch, have endeavored to determine the syllabic signification of the hieroglyphics in conformity with this chimerical principle, which, however, they never applied to more than seventy, and even in respect of two-thirds of these, they were utterly mistaken, because their inquiries were confined to hieroglyphic groups which were entirely irrelevant.

Such, then, is the character of the world-renowned system of Champollion. But how, it will be asked, could the whole world regard and recommend this as the veritable key to the literature of the ancient Egyptians? The question is easily answered. The facility of the French language gave his doctrine ready access everywhere, and our brain is a tablet of marble; whatever is first engraven on it, will endure as long as the material itself. Besides, every one knows that the world gives credence to novelties the more readily, the more marvellous and chimerical they are. Goethe somewhere remarks: "The world cannot comprehend the true, because it is too simple."

And now we will proceed to ascertain, still farther, by practical tests, what Champollion's system amounts to. Champollion had the inscription of Rosetta, with its Greek translation, lying on his table for forty entire years, and yet to his dying hour, he was never able to translate this inscription. And why not? Simply because this inscription was based upon a method of writing, differing altogether, in its princi-

ple, from the one found by Champollion, because he had no conception whatever of the true key to the hieroglyphics.

Champollion was twice in Rome, and examined all the thirteen obelisks of the "Eternal city," and yet he could not find the obelisk translated by Hermapion, although it stood before the eyes of all men, close by the porta del popolo. One day, in 1826, he even asked me whether I had found the obelisk in question, but added, without waiting for my answer, "Sarà in una cantina," it must still lie in some cellar. But although I already knew it well, I still considered it the part of prudence to maintain silence awhile longer, in order to secure what I had acquired.

Champollion's successor, De Rouge, the present director of the Egyptian museum at Paris, published, about four years ago, a translation of a remarkable inscription from the time of Moses, in which he formally renounces Champollion's system, and adopts my syllabic alphabet, of which he possessed a copy, as the basis of his version. He says: "It would have been impossible to translate this inscription according to Champollion's system, in the condition in which he left it." And all Egyptologists have now, like him, gradually adopted my syllabic principle.

A great many proper names of kings and gods, especially those of the Decani, Champollion was unable to read. And why? Because they were expressed syllabically. All the Agnomina of the kings were explained symbolically by him. But these also were syllabic, as we learn from the translations of Eratostenes and Manetho.

After Champollion's death, his most distinguished disciples, Ungarelli and Rosellini, published a translation of the inscriptions on the obelisk at the porta del popolo, made exactly after Champollion's system, in accordance with his grammar and his Dictionaire. It was now time for me to come out with Hermapion's translation of the Flaminian obelisk, which I had discovered in 1826. And what was the result? According to Champollion's system, the sense of the entire inscription had been mistaken, of three words, only half a one had been correctly rendered, and not a single one correctly explained. Thus, for example, Champollion's system gave rise to the following version of the second column on the east side of the obelisk: "From his magnificence this edifice to his beloved, by making his name immortal." Old Hermapion, on the contrary, had rendered thus: "A testimonial of the king, who adorns the abode of the gods, which he had erected,

with beautiful Taautic sculptures on the inclosing walls:" meaning that he adorned them with hieroglyphic figures. There is here a reference to Osimandya 1700 B. C., the greatest of all the Egyptian kings, and to his world-renowned Osimandyum, the ruins of which are now to be seen at Karnac.

We will now proceed to inquire what the inductive proof is worth.

Champollion left behind him a large dictionary of hieroglyphics, with six thousand articles. The signification of these six thousand groups and figures, he determined in the following manner: He ascribes no syllabic signification to any of the hieroglyphics; he very ingeniously represented one-half of the hieroglyphics of an inscription to be symbolic, and gave to the groups, which were followed by a determinative, the signification required by the determinative taken in a symbolical sense. But he did not translate a continuous or connected text, but only short sentences, severed from the context, or isolated words. Now if Champollion's system is correct, then the translation of any and every continuous text, made with the assistance of Champollion's dictionary, must yield a rational meaning, or good sense. If, on the other hand, it is erroneous, it will inevitably give rise to nonsense. We select, as a specimen, a portion of one of the religious books of the ancient Egyptians, of which the contents are indicated by an adjoined vignette. It exhibits the image of the creation in front of the image of the sun, which is emitting burning rays, or, as we say, drawing water; as is wont to be the case when a thunder-storm is approaching. This text, when translated according to Champollion's dictionary and system, reads as follows. All the words occurring in this text are, with few exceptions, defined and translated in Champollion's dictionary. But let us hear:

"The chapter relating to the eye, the god Scarabeus, the mummy of god, appointed the hour, or rather towards the main road, the darkness, the night."

"This is the image of the truth-speaking Osiris: I am the gazelle, the comely one; the instrument, the lake of the heavenly waters, the woman, the illuminating one, the hour, splendor. The beginning, the hour towards the main road, the darkness, the night. The night to the mouth, duality, women, or rather mouth-man inhabiting my sprout. . . . I am the bride, the hour, the darkness, the night are going to the man, the hour, the darkness, the night, he the mouth il-

lumining to me, be duality, stone of the habitations above the heavens, above fame, and his lord with him; to go to me, he towards the mouth illumining; to me the royal crown, the entire domination; he the mouth illumining and the meadow field and enamel, and the two ostrich feathers. My sprig, to will he; the purse, the belongings to me; I who am the bride, the hour, the darkness, the night, to come to me the hour, the darkness, the night, &c."

The real import, however, of this section, is as follows:

"The discourse concerning the nature of God the creator, who speaks in trumpets, and causes the clouds of heaven to flash with lightning."

Thus saith the High and Holy One N. N., the weigher and measurer: it is I who cause the gleaming garment of the heavenly firmament to be shrouded in sack-cloth, when I purpose to speak with my brazen trumpet. Behold the trumpet, the lightning of the clouds of heaven, the thunder-peals of heaven, which proclaim: Fall down upon your knees, ye women! and say, be afraid, be afraid, ye men! Listen to my voice. . . . I am the holder (keeper) of the trumpet of the clouds of heaven. Prostrate yourselves before me, before my trumpet of the clouds of heaven, when my mouth speaks in thunders: prostrate yourselves before me, when I cause the stones of the houses under the heaven, to fall down and chastise those who enter into their chambers. Prostrate yourselves before me, when my mouth calls; fall down before me who am crowned with the crown of power. When my mouth calls, bring ye Byssus flax, meal; bring the frankincense for an offering; give each of you a little fruit, dried grapes every month of the year. For I am the holder of the trumpet of heaven, the Lord. Prostrate yourselves before me, before the trumpet of the clouds of heaven, before the Lord," &c.

After these unedifying, but necessary digressions, we return to Dr. Abbott's museum, and more particularly to the papyri, in order to ascertain what they have to say to us. We will first take up the three largest.

III. THE SACRED WRITINGS OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS.

There was, as is well known, a primitive revelation, which was transmitted from generation to generation, and which even before the flood, was recorded in sacred writings, now no longer extant. Immediately after the fall, the Lord said to the serpent: "It shall bruise thy head:" and of the time

of Seth, it is said: "then began men to call upon the Lord." One of these sacred books was the book of Enoch mentioned in the New Testament. The Hindus likewise relate, that there were sacred records anterior to the flood, after the loss of which men became wicked; whereupon God concluded to extirpate the entire human race. Through Noah these primitive revelations were handed down to all the nations that sprang from his descendants. This accounts for the fact that all the ancient nations were in possession of certain sacred books, like the Sibylline of the Greeke and Romans, the Zendavesta, the Vedas, the Tautic writings of the Egyptians. This too, accounts for the fact, that among all the nations of antiquity, we meet with traces of a Triune God, expectations of a Savior in the course of the sixth millennium after the creation, like doctrines concerning the angels, like temples, like festivals, like forms of worship, like priests, &c. This accounts, lastly, for Virgil's singing shortly before the advent of Christ: "The last age of the world is already approaching. Be propitious to the coming boy, with whom the iron age will end, O chaste Lucina be propitious to him. Then, then will be effaced the traces of our guilt, and the earth will be redeemed from its perpetual terror;" the serpent will die. "Accept, the time is already approaching, O accept the exalted honors, thou dear child of God, descended from great Jupiter." Moses himself has received these primitive revelations, which he transmitted to posterity, enriched by new and more definite ones from Sinai. The Egyptians, in all probability, likewise received primitive revelations of a similar description, in their forty-two sacred records, which, according to their traditions, came from Thoth or Athothis, the son of their first king, Menes, six hundred and sixty-six years after the flood. If these books had contained no truths of a higher order, they would certainly never have been mentioned and described by the church fathers, as e. g. by Clemens Alexandrinus; they would never have been copied so often, and as late as the times of the apostles. Now the three larger papyrus-scrolls in Dr. Abbott's museum are precisely such copies, as proved in a book concerning the Berlin Papyri, as early as 1825. In the European museums there are nearly five hundred such hieroglyphic, hieratic and demotic manuscript copies of these forty-two sacred books of the ancient Egyptians, more or less complete. The most complete is that of Turin, which is sixty feet in length. Now what may be the contents of these books, which are upwards

of forty-six hundred years old? The first book contains the following text:

Title: "This is the book of prayers for the praise of the Lord of Lords, who has resolved to create servants, serving the eternal counselor, the creator of all things."

"The Lord Lords declares, at the same time, in this mummy-scroll, how the deceased Ahabanum, the child of the most holy, the just, the son of the daughter of Phaminis, the just, his mother, has been exalted."

All the papyrus-scrolls of this description belonged to some particular individual, and were, after his decease, deposited with his corpse in the grave, provided he had led a virtuous life. In this case, the name of the deceased was subsequently inserted after that of the creator, in a space designedly left vacant in transcribing, in order to indicate that the soul of the departed was thenceforward to become partaker of all the glories of God. I now proceed to the translation of the first sacred book.

"There is a Most Holy one (a God), a creator of the fullness of earth, a ruler of days (a providence)."

"I am (saith the Lord) the God of Gods, the exalted maker of the planets, and of the (heavenly) hosts, which are praising me above thy head; I, the creator of the exalted race of the mighty of princes and governors, (I) who sit in judgment; (I) the Most Holy one, who condemn the wicked, I (am) myself my king, the preserver of the laws, as long as he walks in the valley of thy promises, O Most Holy (God)." The persons are here sometimes confounded, as in other oriental texts.

"I am the creator of the exalted generations of the mighty (the celestial powers), of the children of heaven, which (the starry heaven), moves in order to disclose the murderers and persecutors of the pious, in order to find the deceivers, the children of the traducer (of Satan) before his (i. e. the creator's) countenance, as long as they walk in the valley of thy promises (i. e. on earth); I, the king of my hosts above thee; I, the planter of my herbs beneath thee."

"I am myself the world, the judge of every deed; myself the light (the sun) that convicts the evil-doer; myself my king, the preserver of the laws of Egypt, who dwelleth at On, the city of the sun."

"I am the light, the son of the primeval light, I dwell in the exalted land of light, I was born in the land of light (with me there is no night)."

"The government is mine, ye men and women of Egypt! Mine, who am the high and holy institutor of the adorations, which in the temples of both Egypts concern the Most Holy one (the creator); mine, who sit in judgment (the holder of courts), the Most Holy one, that convicteth the wicked, mine who have joined together (made) the glory of the sun, the king of the worlds; mine, (who am) the judge and condemner of the wicked, mine, who have fashioned the verdure of the earthly pasture."

"The government is mine, who am the prince of my sun, which clothes all lands, the abodes of man, which illumines the house of worship (the world), which make manifest the heart of the persecutor of the just; mine who determined to make burnt offerings and victims of sacrifice for him whom all the world feareth."

"The government is mine, who am the Lord, who have made my arm, my right arm to be dreaded; the Most Holy one, who hath trampled under foot the abode of the wicked, who hath destroyed (in the deluge) the polluted race of the world, who hath made the children of the deceiver (of Satan) and the insolent in the habitation of wickedness upon earth, to tremble."

"The government is mine, who am the prince, the lord of the festive assemblies of the Most Holy, of the good spirit, of the judge (the triune God); who have ordered the solar years, who hath commanded the sanctification of the seventh day of the week, the celebration of the new moon at On."

"I am that I am, myself my own priest at Tantatho (the sacred city), who slays the victim at Abydos, the delightful city, who slaughters the burnt offering of trespasses for thee: I, the high priest at Abydos, the delightful city; the lord of the offering of unrighteousness for thee; the supreme offerer of burnt victims and of sacrifices, which are brought to him whom all the world feareth."

"It is I who slay the sacred sin offering of the lamb for thee at Tantatho, and who burns it in his flames."

"It is I that weave the garments (i. e. the bodies of men), as I am also the inventor of the loom, I, that devised woof (i. e. in the human body)."

"It is I, that caused the vine, grain, sheaves, threshing and meal to grow in the kingdom of Egypt, the magnificent."

"There is one, who has made the walk of the servants, of the (walking) statues in the house of the Most Holy one (i. e.

in the world) to be upright, who has made your walk upright; it is the spirit (i. e. wisdom) of the most holy and just one; your sovereign."

"The Most Holy one lives; he seeth as ye see; he heareth as ye hear; he standeth as ye stand; he sitteth as ye sit."

"There is one, who giveth to the servants, to the (walking) statues in the house of the Most Holy one, fruit and refreshing drinks of every kind; who giveth to *you* fruit and refreshing drinks of every kind every (new) year of the Most Holy one; and he is your sovereign."

"There is one, who hath lighted the lamps of heaven; one, who hath woven the star-covered path (the milky way) for his servants, the (walking) statues in the house of the Most Holy one; who hath lighted the heavenly lamps for *you*, who hath woven the star-covered path for *you*; and that is the Most Holy one, your sovereign."

"He, whom my prayer in the house of the Most Holy one exalteth, whom my song of praise exalteth, whom the choral anthem praiseth; he the Most Holy and Just."

"He, to whom all the world crieth, and whom they seek and worship on bended knees, whom the choir of the anthems of praise exalteth; to whom the circle of musicians shouteth; he, the sinner in judgment over his harvest-fields on earth; who walketh about in his plantations, your sovereign."

"Yea, the Most Holy one walketh through the terrestrial hosts, when evening hath come, and findeth the derider of those who seek after righteousness, as well as the obscurity of the just, who are concerned for the safety (salvation) of many; who instruct the other servant in the fear of the law."

"He findeth whosoever reveres what is sacred, whosoever humbles his head, whosoever is willing to attend to thy work, to the host of heavenly powers."

"Praise me (saith the Lord), the almighty; seek him, who upholdeth the terrestrial hosts; augment your care for the host of the heavenly powers, of the inhabitants of the celestial firmament, who occupy a habitation like unto your habitation, who walk above the head of the terrestrial hosts."

"I (the Lord) look and see who offers to the Lord of hosts whose image (the sun) is sailing upon the heavenly floods (in the blue firmament), sin offerings and thank offerings, who worships him on bended knees with humility."

"Thus also look ye up to me, all ye children of men in the house of praise, look up, too, to the host of heavenly powers, to the shining garment of the sky, to the carpet of

glory (the starry heavens), to the mansions of the host of mighty, who work for their master for my glory; look up to me, who have established my kingdom above the heavens."

"Hearken unto me, my servant! Weave garments, weave cloths, weave linen, girdles, bracelets of thanks for me in humility of heart, and in profoundest reverence, for me who am the Lord of all." Here begins the anthem of praise to God, as follows:

"Praise be to thy countenance, who hast woven the hosts of worlds, thou High and Holy God! Thou Lord of all that breathes the breath of life: who adornest the entire earth! Let me praise the architect who has made the terrestrial hosts; who at the appointed time hath caused all things on earth and beyond the world, to spring into existence, who hath constructed them all for me."

"Songs and anthems of praise to the master-architect, who made the world for me, who made it for the habitation of man, the creator's image; praise be to him, who once created that splendid garment of the sky, that alternation of the two heavenly luminaries (sun and moon) every year around."

"I shout praises to the Lord, to the good spirit, to the Holy one; I serve the Lord, whom all lands fear, to the most Holy one at Tantatho (in the land of light)."

"I extol the works of the Lord, which delight my heart, as long as I walk in the house of the Lord (on earth)."

"O that the words of my mouth, and the works of my hand, who am mean and unworthy, may be acceptable."

Here follow now the concluding observations to this first book of the sacred writings of the ancient Egyptians."

"Here endeth the first book, the introduction to the writings contained in this sacred mummy-scroll, which glorifies the Lord of the universe."

"O that the Lord might be exalted in his holy temple, that he might be worshipped with bended knee, that corn of every kind, refreshing drinks, sheaves, textures of linen and wool might be brought to him upon the altar of the Lord God; (might be brought) to him, before whom the meadows and woods of both upper and lower Egypt are bowing their heads, that fields and gardens might be offered to him (to his temples)."

"For his is the end, as is his the beginning (of all things)."

Now what do we learn from these religious books of the ancient Egyptians, which have so long been enveloped in im-

penetrable darkness? They tell us, in the first place, how men, whose descendants we are, thought, spoke, acted, and worshipped our Lord and Master forty-six hundred years ago. Such, and perhaps still better, may have been the state of things six hundred and sixty-six years earlier, in the family of Noah. Whether the world in general, at the present time, has advanced further in piety like this, I leave to every one to answer for himself.

We, in the next place, find here another proof, that there really was a primitive revelation. For, of themselves, the ancient Egyptians would never have known any thing concerning a triune God, concerning the angels, his ministers; concerning a father of lies, concerning the creation, the flood, the sanctification of the Sabbath, concerning the typical sacrifice of the lamb, concerning the High and other priests.

We learn, moreover, and in the last place, what were properly the objects of religious worship among all the ancient nations of the globe. The highest object of every form of worship was the creator and governor of all things; The "Most Holy one;" "The father of Gods and men, Zeus," the "Deus optimus maximus," "Zedek (the just one) with his seven sons," the "great king with his seven ministers." Besides, they did not, as is now generally assumed, worship the local powers of nature, animals and plants, but higher beings, created by God, and of an intermediate nature between God and man, who work for their Lord and for his glory." These are the above-named seven sons of Zedek, those seven Kabiri of the Greeks, the Romans and others; those seven ministers of the Most High, through whom he governs the world. According to the already corrupted opinion of the ancients, the seven planets were the bodies of these seven Kabiri, and the twelve constellations of the zodiac were the mansions of the twelve dii majores. Sacred animals were held in veneration by the ancient Egyptians, merely because they were, according to the statement of the ancients themselves, regarded as the "symbols of the divine creative powers, which revealed the single deities." Besides this, it is extremely probable, that these sacred writings will, in time, make us acquainted with many other things, of which we, at present, have as yet scarcely any conception: they will bring nearer to us an age and a world, which thus far has lain far beyond our horizon.

IV. THE JUDICIUM MORTUORUM, (*Judgment of the dead.*)

Nearly all the manuscript copies of the sacred records of the Egyptians, contain a pictorial representation of the judgment, to which the souls of the deceased were forced to submit, before they were either united with the Lord, or consigned to perdition. They nearly all contain the same figures, and are accompanied by almost the same inscriptions. The entire picture represents the celestial judgment-hall. In the middle of the top of it are inscribed the words: "House of the Tribunal;" on both sides, there are five times repeated, the words: "Light, revelation, justice." In the background towards the left, is seated the Most Holy one, upon his throne, surrounded by the holy of the holies. Before him are stationed the witnesses of the tribunal, of which all are personified, as, for example, the forty-two personages on the pediment, signifying the forty-two cardinal virtues (*justitiae*, Diodor. I. 92), below appear pity, loyalty, just weight and measure, the four seasons of the year (the *horae*), which had witnessed all the actions of the deceased; further to the right stands Thoth (the world). Behind him are seen both the Cabiri, Day (Horus) and Night (Amibis), which are balancing the virtue of the deceased, and the foibles of his heart, against each other, in a pair of scales. The result is recorded by Thoth upon a tablet, in order to present it to the judge. Hereupon follows justice, who introduces the soul of the deceased "into the secret mansion of God (into heaven) in order that there it may worship the creator face to face, throughout all eternity." The soul thus introduced by justice, approaches the Most Holy one with the following words (which are annexed to the figure): "Let me enter in among the people for all times. I have carefully refrained from committing murder. I have carefully refrained from trespassing (robbing). I have carefully refrained from secret fraud and deception (from lying). I have maintained reverence for the gods, and respect for the law. I have praised thy countenance, thou creator of terrestrial hosts, thou sacred Being, God, Lord of Abydos (lord of time); who impartest light to thy servants, flashes of light to the darkness of night. O Lord, I have loved thy servants, who walk in the house of thanksgiving and praise (on earth). I have exalted, I have glorified him, who has made all the world, in this house of creation, ever since I have walked among the

terrestrial (hosts) I have brought sacrifices in abundance in the house of worship, in the house of praise (upon earth).

V. THE DEMOTIC DOCUMENTS.

The administration of justice among the ancient Egyptians was formerly entirely unknown to us. In the course of time, however, a multitude of demotic, hieratic and Greek papyri were brought into Europe, which documents diffused a great deal of light on this point, and enlightened us respecting the history of ancient jurisprudence. The Greek translations and subscriptions of judicial documents from all parts of Egypt, served especially as valuable aids in this respect. Now we know that there were tribunals, or courts of justice, in every city, that all sales or conveyances of property, were required to be made according to a regular legal process, that sixteen witnesses were necessary to their validity, that of every deed there existed an original document and an antigraphon, that purchases and sales were effected with the utmost circumstantiality and caution, and that the persons concerned were as minutely described as in lettres de cachet. All the documents of this kind begin with the year, month and day of the reigning sovereign; they make mention of his predecessors, and of the priests and priestesses then living. No American deed can offer greater security than one of these papyri of the ancient Egyptians. Precisely the same arrangement is to be observed in the legal documents from the times of Psamstichos, Darius, Xerxes, Ramses (1650 B. C.) and Amos (1800 B. C.), which are preserved in the museum at Turin. Dr. Abbott's collection contains six documents of this kind, and even a large papyrus, which is not yet cut asunder, and presents both the original document and its antigraphon. These are all from the time of the Lagidae; more particularly from the age of Ptolemaeus Epiphanes, two hundred and two years before Christ, and will furnish many a valuable contribution to the history of jurisprudence.

VI. THE PHENIX.

Nearly all the copies of the sacred writings of Egypt contain, as is evident from Dr. Abbott's papyrus, No. 766, among others, a religious consideration of two birds, *Penoh* and *Choli*, placed side by side, and are distinguished from each other only by the long feathers which adorn the head of the former. These two birds have reference to the well

known myth concerning the phoenix. For the word *Penoh* is identical with phoenix; and Hermapion translates the picture of that bird sitting on his funeral pile, which is to be observed in the Flaminian obelisk, by phoenix. The name *Choli* corresponds exactly with the name of phoenix in the book of Job, where it is *chol*, and also with the later Coptic *Alloe*. Now what may be the true meaning of the ancient myth concerning the phoenix, which has been preserved and transmitted upon monuments and coins, even down to the time of St. Cæcilia? The ancients themselves, who were very well acquainted with the import of this myth, give us only the following brief account of it: There is a bird, of which there is but one specimen in the world, and which comes flying from the East once in the course of every six hundred and fifty-one years, in company with many other birds, and after its arrival in the city of the sun (Heliopolis) here burns itself up, about the time of the vernal equinox, whereupon it rises again out of its ashes, and flies away again, to return no more till after the expiration of six hundred and fifty-one years. This phoenix made his first appearance in the reign of Sesostris, then again during the reign of Amos, and the last time amid great festivities, in the sixth year of Claudius. There was, however, also a pseudo phoenix (*chol*), which consigned itself to the flames as early as the autumn of the five hundred and thirty-ninth year, and besides, made its appearance repeatedly during the interval. The latter event occurred under the consuls, 310 B. C., under Evergeta I., under the consuls, 37 after Christ, under Trajan, during the second and sixth years of the reign of Antoninus Pius, under Caracalla, Caius, Constantine the Great, Constantine II., and others. It has now been ascertained that this singular myth signified nothing more than the transit of Mercury across the disk of the sun. The bird phoenix was an emblem of Mercury, as we are informed by the Isis-table (*Tabula Bembina*). There is but one planet Mercury, as there was but one phoenix. The city of the sun, in which the phoenix was accustomed to consign himself to the flames, is simply the sun, or the house of the god, sun, in which Mercury, during his passage through the disk, may be said to be consumed by fire. As the phoenix burns himself up every six hundred and fifty-one years, about the time of the vernal equinox, so Mercury subjects himself to a similar process every six hundred and fifty-one years, on nearly the same days of the year. Mercury passes always from east to west,

across the disk of the sun; it is exactly the same with the phoenix. Whilst Mercury enters upon his passage across the disk of the sun, performing his flight into the disk of the sun, he is attended by a multitude of stars; and in a similar manner, the phoenix is accompanied by a multitude of minor birds (flying stars). As the phoenix came forth anew out of his ashes in the sixth year of Claudius, under Amos and Sesostris, and always at the expiration of six hundred and fifty-one years, so Mercury was likewise, as it were, born again in the years 50 A. C., in 1904 and 2555 B. C. Precisely as another and different phoenix consigns himself to the flames in the autumn, always after the expiration of five hundred and thirty-nine years, and according to circumstances, still more frequently; so does Mercury. Like the phoenix, Mercury has also made his transit over the sun's disk on October 10th A. 310 B. C., on April 11th A. 227 B. C., on April 13th A. D. 37, on April 19th A. D. 109, on Oct. 25th A. D. 138, on April 18th A. D. 142, on Oct. 24th A. D. 217, on Oct. 23d A. D. 283, on April 20th A. D. 326, and on April 22d A. D. 339. In a word, there was a phoenix-period and a mercurial-period of six hundred and fifty-one, and of five hundred and thirty-nine years. In the same years in which the phoenix had destroyed himself with fire in the city of the sun, Mercury had likewise performed his transit over the sun.

But it will be asked, what benefit can we derive from these astronomical observations of the Egyptians, which go back as far as the year 2555 B. C.? They show us, in the first place, how far this nation had already, at that time, advanced in the science of astronomy. And moreover, as the transits of Mercury very rarely occur, and are based upon infallible calculations, these facts, as they are distinctly stated to have occurred in particular specified years of certain sovereigns, will serve to rectify ancient history and chronology. They will, as we shall see hereafter, assist us in showing, that Petavius, the originator of the chronology now generally in use, has put all the events of Greek and Roman history a year, and respectively two too high, and that the whole history of Egypt, as determined by Messrs. Boekh, Bunsen and Lepsius, will have to move down three thousand years.

VII. THE APIS-MUMMIES.

It is true, that no Egyptian museum is, as yet, in possession of such an Apis-mummy. But what information can we

gain from these ancient bulls? The voice of no bull is at all agreeable to the ear, and yet from those we shall learn very agreeable things. We learn from them, in the first place, how admirably the ancient Egyptians understood the art of preserving dead bodies for thousands of years. How can they have effected this? Herodotus affirms, that they employed *oinos phoenikios*, οἶνος φοινίκιος, and that the process occupied the space of several months. But what may have been this palm-wine, which is the literal translation of the word? This substance was, as we now know, nothing more than pyroligneous acid, which is found in the smoke of burning wood, and contains a large quantity of creosote. Thus the mummies of the ancients were nothing more than our smoked hams. Creosote and pyrolignic acid possess the property of desiccating meat or flesh completely, in the process of time, and of preserving it against putrefaction and worms. If the practice should be revived, of administering the flesh of mummies as medicine, to which purpose our ancestors probably appropriated many an entire mummy, then these three bulls would alone suffice to supply all the apothecary-shops of America with pills three thousand years of age.

But these Apis-mummies have yet another much more important value, even in confirming the truth of the sacred scriptures. The Egyptians are known to have computed their time, in the transactions of ordinary life, according to vague years of three hundred and sixty-five days, without any intercalary day. Hence it happened, that the first day of the year would come one day too early once in every four years, and so it went on, till after the expiration of fourteen hundred and sixty-one vague years, the new-year's day, which was the first day of the month of Thoth, would again coincide with our 20th of July. On the same day the dog-star, Sirius, rose in Egypt, shortly before sunrise. Hence it came, that the Egyptians denominated the period of fourteen hundred and sixty-one vague years, which began in the year in which the dog-star rose heliacally on the 1st of Thoth, or on our 20th of July, a canicular period, or *Periodus Lothica*. Now these canicular periods commenced on the 20th of July, in the year 2781 and 1322 B. C., and the last time in the year 139 p. e. n. About the year 1322 B. C., the Egyptians made the important discovery, that at the commencement of the second canicular period, on the 1st of Thoth, 1322 B. C., the moon was in its first quarter; exactly as it had been on

the 1st of Thoth, twenty-five years before; in short, that after the lapse of twenty-five vague years, the moon presented again precisely the same shape on the same day, and at the same hour. This observation, which proved conclusively, that the creator had, from eternity, so ordained the course of the sun and moon, that after the lapse of twenty-five years, they would again be at exactly the same distances from each other, appeared of such importance to the pious Egyptians, that for this reason they instituted a division of time into periods of twenty-five years, and expressed this sacred period by a living symbol, i. e., by the Apis-bull. The bull was, among the Egyptians, an emblem of the sun; the Apis-bull, however, representing as it did, at the same time also the moon, and the conjunction of the sun and moon on the 1st of Thoth, required to have marked upon it the symbolic signs of the moon. The Egyptians therefore selected, for the worship of Apis, who, according to Plutarch, was to them a living image of the divine wisdom, of the soul of Osiris, a black bull, which had a crescent on its side, and a wart in the shape of a beetle, (which likewise designated the moon) under the tongue.

This Apis-bull was worshipped in a temple of his own, at Memphis, and at the expiration of twenty-five years, when the Apis period was at an end, it was killed, embalmed in the shape of a mummy, and in commemoration of the quarter of a century just past, solemnly interred for preservation in one of the Apis-catacombs. An Apis-catacomb of this description, full of Apis-mummies and inscriptions, was discovered a few years ago, by Mariette, a French Savant.

But the question now arises, in what year the Apis-periods began. This question is answered by several coins, which were struck under the Roman emperors after the commencement of the third canicular period, and which dated the beginning of the Apis-period from the same year with which the canicular period had begun, i. e. the year 139 p. c. n. The Apis-periods, therefore, commenced simultaneously with the canicular periods, as is manifest from the moon-crescent on the side of the Apis-bull, and from the nature of the case itself. This is a fact of great importance in ancient history. For the ancient historians record, in several places, in what years of the Persian, Greek, and Roman sovereigns, an Apis-period commenced again. And thus it has been ascertained that the unfortunate Petavius, whom all our historians have to this day implicitly followed, has put the dates of all these

sovereigns too far back, by two years. Thus Alexander the Great did not die 324 or 323, but not until 321 years B. C.; the seventh year of Cambyzes was not 723, but 721 B. C.; Cyrus did not ascend the throne in 538, but in 534 B. C.; as is proved by still other incontrovertible facts, especially by the eclipses of this time.

This goes, in the next place, to establish and confirm a biblical tradition, which ought never been so rashly and unscrupulously assailed. The prophets and chroniclers assure us repeatedly, that the Babylonian Captivity lasted seventy entire years. But according to Petavius, we cannot even make out sixty-six years, simply because he has put Cyrus four years too early. But as Cyrus is now brought down to a date by four years later, that is, to the 534th year B. C., the Babylonian Captivity actually extends through a period of seventy years. In the spring of the year 533, the Hebrews returned to Jerusalem, and on the 25th of September, of the year 533 B. C., on a Saturday, the twenty-four classes of priests commenced again their weekly rounds of duty, until, on the 22d of September, of the second year before the commencement of the christian era, the birth of John the Baptist was announced to Zacharias, who belonged to the eighth class of the priests, i. e. to the class Abia.

From these corrections of ancient history it likewise follows, as many have already surmised, that the entire historical canon of Ptolemaeus down to Titus, is entirely erroneous. Consequently, the eclipses recorded by the ancients, must have been different from those which Ptolemy calculated, and our lunar tables must be based upon a different motion of lunar nodes, from that assumed by Ptolemy. In the year 130 after Christ, Ptolemy undertook to construct the first lunar tables, in which he endeavored to determine the elements of the lunar motion. With this end in view, he started upon the basis of the earliest eclipses of the moon, and his own observations. He found, however, in older authorities, nothing further than the bare announcement of the fact, that in certain years of the reign of certain kings, as far back as 721 B. C., fourteen different eclipses of the moon had been witnessed. But in prosecuting his task, he had the misfortune to be guided by erroneous chronological tables, in consequence of which, he placed the eclipses in question into the wrong years, and necessarily determined the place of the moon's nodes incorrectly. The later astronomers, as far down as the time of Burckhardt and Damoiseau, without any

regard whatever to the facts of history, labored under the delusion, that those lunar eclipses, mentioned by Ptolemy, had been observed to the nicety of a minute, by the Babylonians themselves; and hence their repetition of the errors of Ptolemy. We can easily conceive that these new lunar tables, which were based upon entirely false premises, could only for a short time correspond with the observations of later eclipses. It was therefore necessary to construct new tables every one hundred years, and even still more frequently. We now comprehend, at last, why it is that all the lunar tables thus far in use, are not in harmony with the most recent observations of eclipses, as is proved by the total eclipse of the sun, which occurred in Germany in 1851, and also in what place the lunar node must really have been in 721 B. C. It is obvious that this fact is one the utmost importance in astronomy. We now also know the date of the celebrated total eclipse of the sun, so long an object of anxious inquiry, mentioned by Thales as having occurred during the battle between the Medes and Lydians, on the Halys. It did not take place 610 years B. C., according to which the mother of Cyrus would have been but twelve years of age at the time of her marriage; but on the 18th of May 622 B. C., which would make Mandane twenty-three years of age.

VIII. THE ASTRONOMY OF THE EGYPTIANS.

Diodorus asserts as an eye-witness, that the Egyptians, "from time immemorial, had been in the habit of making and recording astronomical observations on all the planets." An example of this is furnished us by the above-mentioned papyrus in Dr. Abbott's collection, which, besides, is remarkable for this reason also, that it contains demotic explanations, and that it is the only one of the kind at present known to us. But in what way did the ancient Egyptians express and preserve their astronomical observations? In answering this inquiry, we find, in the first place, among the ancients, a statement to the effect, that they designated the seven planets by means of the images of their seven supreme divinities, the Cabiri, and the twelve signs of the zodiac by means of the images of their twelve greater gods. The ancients, in consequence of their ignorance of the telescope, were acquainted with only seven planets, arranged in a series according to their several velocities, thus: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon. The zodiac is the ball of the heavens, within which these seven planets perform their

perpetual revolutions. The middle of this belt is the line on which the sun advances, or the ecliptic, a circle which, like all others, was divided into three hundred and sixty degrees. The zodiac is divided into twelve sections of thirty degrees, and each of these sections contained a group of stars, into which the imagination conjured figures of men, animals and utensils; whence the name of the zodiac (which is literally a circle or belt of animals). These images or signs of the zodiac are, in their regular order, as follows: Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces; their course, when observed with the north pole behind the spectator, is, like that of the sun, moon, and planets, from right to left. Each of these signs of thirty degrees in length, was again subdivided into three smaller sections of ten degrees (*Dicuria*), into five sections of different lengths (*Horia*), into twelve sections of two and a half degrees (*Dodecatemoria*) and lastly into thirty sections of one degree (*moirae*), and every one of these subdivisions of the zodiac was presided over respectively by one of the inferior divinities.

It was by means of these divinities, and their symbols, therefore, that the Egyptians expressed their astronomical observations, and more particularly the position of the seven planets at the time of memorable events. They brought the images of the seven planetary gods in connection with the images of the twelve zodiacal gods, and with the subordinate deities of each sign, with which a planet stood in conjunction. This could, of course, be accomplished in several ways, as we can at once show by a few examples. It is scarcely necessary to state beforehand, that with the assistance of our astronomical tables, these ancient planetary constellations can easily be calculated with mathematical certainty, to the year and day. For a planetary constellation, showing only the signs of the zodiac, in which the seven planets formerly stood at a particular time, can, according to well known astronomical laws, occur but once in twenty-one hundred and forty-six years; but planetary constellations, showing the *Dicuriae*, *Horia*, *Dodecatemoria* and degrees in which the seven planets formerly stood, can occur but once in the entire course of history, nay even in millions of years. All the events of ancient history, to which such constellations, as observed by the ancients themselves, are linked, are by means of these planetary constellations, determined with incontrovertible certainty. And this is of the utmost importance for the cor-

rection of ancient history. Several hundred such planetary constellations have been preserved, partly in the historical works of the ancients, partly on their monuments, on the pyramids, on temples, in the catacombs, on the sarcophagi, mummy-chests, tables of stone, papyrus-scrolls, &c. Among the Egyptians, they go back as far as the year 2781 B. C.; among the Greeks, as far as 778 B. C.; among the Romans, as far as 752 B. C.; among the oriental nations, as far as the years 3447 and 5871 B. C. Among the most remarkable of them are the following:

IX. THE ZODIAC OF DENDERA.

In the year 1799 the French Savants, who accompanied Bonaparte to Egypt, discovered, on the ceiling of the little temple at Dendera, a carved representation of the heavens, with the signs of the zodiac, and other figures. After this stone slab, which formed the ceiling of the temple, had been cut out with a saw, and transported to Paris, the grand discovery was made, that this monument was at least seventeen thousand years old, and that the flood and the creation were myths. From that time to the year 1833, upwards of fifty works of this character have been published. This praeadamitic chimera soon created so great a sensation, that it was found expedient to make it invisible in Paris, by locking it up in a dark room. Meanwhile the key to the astronomical inscriptions of the ancient Egyptians had been found in 1833, from which it appeared that this zodiac of Dendera contains a planetary constellation, by means of which the exact date of this much discussed monument could be determined by its own evidence. We observe, namely, besides other heavenly constellations, expressed by certain figures, the twelve signs of the zodiac, and also the images of the seven planetary gods, which are distinguished from all the rest by the circumstance, that they, like the planetary gods on all other astronomical inscriptions, bear in their hand the sceptre (*zor*, the mighty, puissant one) and the ansated cross (*anak*, prince)

We find, therefore, that at the time of the construction of the temple of Dendera, Saturn stood in Virgo, Jupiter in Libra, Mars in Gemini, the Sun, Venus and Mercury in Aquarius, and the Moon in Taurus. Every planetary constellation of the kind, can be easily calculated: and what was now the result with reference to the date in question? It was not the year 17000 B. C., but the 11th of February, of the thirty-seventh year after Christ, which was the year of the birth of

Nero. This emperor had, according to the account of the Roman writers, constructed and restored many temples in Egypt, and Nero's name is, even at the present time, still to be found on every side of the temple at Dendena, and half of it even on the zodiac at Paris. Thus ended the merry tragedy of the zodiac at Dendena.

X. THE ISIS-TABLE (*Tabula Bembina*).

Two hundred years ago, a magnificent bronze tablet or plate, inlaid with a great many silver figures of the gods, was dug up in the city of Rome, and came into the possession of Cardinal Bembi, whence it has been designated ever since as the *Tabula Bembina*. After an examination of many years, the discovery was made that this table had been executed as early as the time of Moses, and that it contained the secrets of the magnetic needle. A closer examination in the year 1833, however, led to the conclusion, that this table represented in its twelve squares, nothing more than the twelve signs of the zodiac, expressed by means of the twelve superior deities of the Egyptians, and that it furthermore contained, in certain squares or signs, the figures of the seven Cabiri or planets. It was thus found that the antemosaic and magnetic Isis-table exhibits the planetary constellation of the year 54 after Christ, in which year Trajan was born. And it actually contains the names of *Cæsar Trajannos*, and those of his wife and daughter, *Plotina* and *Sabina*.

XI. THE SARCOPHAGUS OF OSIMANDYA.

About forty years ago, Balzoni discovered, near Thebes, in the valley of Biban el Moluk (the graves of the kings), a large catacomb, which had never been opened, and which contained thousands of mummies, with which he cooked billah for himself and his fellahs. In the innermost chamber, however, he found a costly colossal royal sarcophagus, made of alabaster, and covered, both externally and internally, with inscriptions and images of divinities; which subsequently was brought into the museum of the architect Soane at London, through the agency of consul Salt. This sarcophagus once contained the lifeless remains of Osimandya, the greatest king of Egypt, and father of Ramses the great, the last king of the eighteenth dynasty. To this same Osimandya and Ramses, was dedicated the obelisk, with Hermapion's translation, now standing near the porta del popolo at Rome.

The sarcophagus of this Ramses the great, was likewise discovered by Belzoni, in a catacomb of the vicinity. It is now in Paris, and its lid at Cambridge. The diagrams of both these catacombs, on papyrus-scrolls of the same age, showing all their chambers, and their length, breadth and height, was found at Turin, by myself, in the year 1827. On these two sarcophagi are inscribed the planetary constellations at the birth of the two kings already named from the years 1731 and 1694 B. C. The planetary constellation of Osimandya, in Soane's sarcophagus, is also found on the colossal ruins near Karnac, in the vicinity of Thebes. It follows from this, that the ancient Osimandyeum, the largest edifice of antiquity, and minutely described by Diodorus, was what is now known as the ruins of Karnac. Its gigantic columns, which are so large, that one hundred men can find standing-room upon one of its capitals, are still standing to this very day, simply because the vandal hand of Cambyses was unable to overturn them.

XII. THE PLANETARY CONSTELLATION OF MENES.

Among the greatest curiosities of Dr. Abbott's museum, is a necklace containing the name of Menes Athothis. This work of art reminds us of the founder of the Egyptian empire, of the first king of the land, concerning whom there has been so much contention during the last three centuries. It is a fortunate circumstance, that the Egyptians made an observation of the planetary constellation at the time of Menes' arrival in Egypt, and that it has been preserved for us in their temples and in their sacred writings, even to the present day. We are at present already acquainted with sixteen temples and monuments, which exhibit a representation of this very planetary constellation of Menes. On the majority of them, the ancient Menes stands opposite to the row of the gods, his only garment being a tiger skin; on others his person and his name are expressed by means of the crescent, i. e. the letters M. N. (Menes). The most concise expression of this planetary constellation, is to be found in the said temple near Karnac, from the year 1700 B. C. Each of the seven planetary gods is seated on a chair, together with one of the twelve gods in whose sign the planet at the time happened to stand. We therefore find the sun in Cancer (0°), the Moon in Scorpio, Saturn in Sagittarius, Jupiter in Aries, Mars in Sagittarius 10° , Venus in Cancer 10° , Mercury in Cancer 5° . This planetary constellation, which

has occurred but once in history, has reference to the year 2781 B. C., to the sixteenth of the Julian July, which was, at that time, the day of the summer solstice. It is by such methods, therefore, that the Egyptians expressed and transmitted their astronomical observations from Menes down to Constantine. Several hundred of them have been preserved to this very day. They determine the natal year of Pharaohs, of priests and private individuals, for example, from the years 1833, 1632, 1573, 1524, 1104, 787, 661, 621, B. C., &c.

XIII. THE PLANETARY CONSTELLATIONS OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS.

By means of the key to the astronomy of the ancient Egyptians, we have also found the key to the Greek and Roman astronomical monuments. We are already familiar with the manner in which the Greeks and Romans denominated their seven planets, and expressed them by means of the images of their seven Cabiri (Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercury and Luna). To which signs of the zodiac, the twelve Dii majores of the Greeks and Romans related, the ancients have themselves told us. It was, consequently, easy to explain also the astronomical monuments of the Greeks and Romans. Examples of this description are found in their authors, on their temples, houses, altars, Etruscan vases, lamps, &c. Among the Greek planetary constellations, which were denominated *hierae Klinae*, we may mention the Olympian double-altars from the year 778 B. C., which was the commencement of the Olympiads; the planetary constellation on the statue of the Olympic Zeus, 490 B. C., having reference to the battle of Marathon; the planetary constellation on the frieze of the Parthenon from the year 480 B. C., referring to the battle of Salamis, &c.

In precisely the same way the lectisternia of the Romans mentioned by Livy and others, likewise denoted planetary constellations; as, for example, the lectisternium 397 B. C., under the tribunes, Augurinus and Priscus, and that of 217 B. C., after the battle against Hannibal, near lake Thrasimenus. The Roman altars (*Arae*) contain the planetary constellations at the birth of the Roman emperors, to whom they were dedicated. We thus find on the *ara albani*, the nativity of Augustus, of the year 63 B. C.; on the Puteolian plinth that of Tiberius, of the year 40 B. C.; on the Capitoline puteal and on the Borghesian Ara, that of Claudius,

of the year 9 B. C.; on the Gabinian Ara that of Vespasian nine years after Christ, &c.

XIV. THE PLANETARY CONSTELLATIONS OF THE FOUR AGES OF THE WORLD.

Astronomy is, according to the accounts of the ancients, coeval with the human family. Josephus already assures us, that Seth was the originator of this science, and the Egyptians trace it back to a period as early. That astronomy extends back to a period prior to the time of Noah, is manifest beyond a doubt, from the fact, that among all the nations of antiquity, we meet with the same zodiac, and the same arbitrary divisions of it, the so called *hypsomata* of the planets, that is to say, certain remarkable degrees of the zodiac, &c. Among these ancient nations, we may instance particularly the Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, Aethiopians, Arabians, Phœnicians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, Persians, Mexicans. It will, consequently, not be surprising to us, that antiquity should have transmitted to us astronomical observations of a far earlier date, observations which, in whatever way we may explain them, go back as far as the creation of man. To these belong the four ages of the world; and the planetary constellations observed at their respective commencements. All the ancient nations were acquainted with the gradual revolution of the entire starry heavens, and their great world-period of thirty-six thousand years, was based upon this fact. On the day of the vernal equinox, in the year 1784, the disk of the sun may have covered a certain star at the ecliptic, but on the same day, 1856, the same star stood aside the sun towards the east; it removed during these seventy-two years, one degree, or two diameters of the moon. This phenomenon is termed the precession of the equinoctial points. As the ancients had no telescopes, they were unable to determine this precession with sufficient accuracy, and assumed, that the heavens moved but one degree in every one hundred years. Now, as the ecliptic, in which the sun performs its course, is divided into three hundred and sixty degrees, the ancients calculated thirty-six thousand years for the revolution of the entire heaven; and as the ecliptic was divided into twelve signs, of thirty degrees each, the time of the precession of the heavens through one sign, or thirty degrees, would consequently be three thousand years. The periods during which the equinoctial point passes through the different signs of thirty de-

grees, constituted the basis of the so called ages of the world, among the ancients, as we learn even from Daniel's colossal image (a symbol of Time), with its head of gold, its chest of silver, its brazen body, and its iron feet. The Greeks and Romans expressed these ages by means of the reigns of the gods. In the first, or golden age, Uranus was on the throne, in the second, or silver age, Saturn, in the third, or brazen, Jupiter, in the fourth, or iron, Mars; i. e., consequently in the four periods of time in which the equinoctial point passes through the signs Gemini, Taurus, Aries, and Pisces, in which at the present time the sun stands on the day of the vernal equinox. Each of these four ages of the world comprised, as we have already shown, a period of three thousand years, in round numbers: as, however, the equinoctial point moves backward a degree, even in seventy-two years, the exact number of years for each world-age is twenty-one hundred and forty-six. We are now ready for the enquiry, in what years, and on what days these four periods may have begun? It is self-evident that this enquiry is of the utmost importance, inasmuch as these ages, among all the ancient nations, began with the very year and the day of creation, and are based upon mathematical and incontestable truths. Now the ancients have preserved the observations of the planetary constellations, as they took place at the commencement of these four periods respectively. The planetary constellation at the commencement of the fourth age of the world, in which we still live, is to be found in the later Vedas, the sacred writings of the Hindus. It relates to the year 598 after Christ, and in that same year, the equinoctial point passed out of Aries into Pisces. The planetary constellation of the beginning of the third age, is preserved in the Ramayana, the celebrated epopee of the ancient Hindus, and relates to the year 1579 B. C., to the same year in which the equinoctial point passed out of Taurus into Aries. The planetary constellation at the commencement of the second age, is recorded in the Zendavesta, the sacred scriptures of the Parsees, and relates to the year 3725 B. C., in which the equinoctial point passed out of Gemini into Taurus. And lastly, the planetary constellation, at the commencement of the first age of the world, has been preserved to us by all the nations of antiquity. We find it in the Hypsomata (beginnings of the planets) of the Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, Arabians, Persians, Chaldeans, Hindus, &c. The most explicit account of it is given by the translator of the chronicle of *Abu*

Dschafar, Mohamed Tabani. It is as follows: "Know then, that the astronomers, Aristotle, Hipparchus and other great masters of this science, make mention of the time, which is to elapse from Adam (peace be with him) to the day of judgment. Those masters inform us, that at the time, when the Almighty and incomparable one created the moon, the sun and planets, every one of these heavenly bodies remained motionless in its place, until the command went forth from God. At that time Saturn stood in *Libra* 21° , Jupiter in *Cancer* 15° , Mars in *Capricornus* 28° , the Sun in *Aries* 19° (others correctly in 0°), Venus in *Pisces* 27° , Mercury in *Virgo* 15° (others correctly in *Pisces* 27°), and the Moon in *Taurus* 3° . This was the beginning of the world, and since that time, the planets have never again been in the same position." And so it is, for such a planetary constellation can occur but once in millions of years. It took place in no other year, and on no other day, than the year 5871 B. C., and on the 10th of the Julian May, which, at that time, was the day of the vernal equinox. On that day the sun stood near the first star of Gemini (*Castor* and *Pollux*, which the celestial globes of the Arabs call *Adam* and *Eve*). As for the rest, it will be perceived, that these epochs of the four ages of the world, 5871, 3725, 1579 B. C., and 598 p. e. n., are separated from each other by an interval of twenty-one hundred and forty-six years, during which the heavens advance through one sign of 30° . It was the last age only, that was made thirty years too long by the Hindus. Among the most ancient astronomical observations of our forefathers, we are yet to mention,

XV. THE PLANETARY CONSTELLATION IN THE ALPHABET.

What may be the age of our alphabet, and in what year was it invented, or at any rate, did it receive its present arrangement? Many are now of the opinion, that our alphabet was invented by *Cadmus*, the Phœnician, about 1500 B. C.; that, consequently, at the time of *Moses*, the art of writing was as yet unknown, and that consequently the pentateuch could not have originated with *Moses*. But as respects the Phœnician *Cadmus*, this ancient tradition rather imports that we owe the alphabet to the "Phœnicians from eternity," i. e. to the Noachians, and that the name *Cadmus* rather signifies the Ancient or the Ancestor, consequently none other than our ancestor *Noah*. First of all, it is obvious to every one, that even before the deluge, during the long interval

from the creation until Noah, which embraced a period of no less than twenty-four hundred and twenty-four years, an alphabet of some kind must have existed. For the New Testament makes express mention of the book of Enoch: the Koran, the Vedas, the book of the Zendavesta, the apocryphal writings of the Old Testament; Hyginus, the Phœnician Sanchoniathon, the Chaldean Berosus, and others affirm, that books and an alphabet existed already before the flood, and that the latter was invented or newly arranged by Noah himself. These historical traditions are confirmed by the very fact, that all the alphabets of the world coincide with each other in point of the number, order, form, name and signification of the letters, and consequently they must have originated at the time when there was, as yet, only one people in the world. All the ancient alphabets agree in respect of the first twenty-five letters, and Plutarch has already remarked, that the alphabet of the ancient Egyptians, whose literature goes back, as we have already seen, as far as the six hundred and sixty-sixth year after the flood, also contained twenty-five letters. That now and then a letter should have become obsolete, and been eventually dropped entirely, or subsequently appended to the last letter, *u*, this cannot be a matter of surprise. All the alphabets commence with *a. b. c.*, and end with *s. t. u.* These twenty-five letters were originally pictures or figures of objects belonging to ordinary life, from which they also derived their names; and every letter expressed the sound with which its name began. The ancient *a* signified a bull's head, in the Hebrew *aleph*, and consequently expressed the vowel *a*. Now if the alphabet had not been invented until nineteen hundred years after the deluge, then the Greeks would have adapted to their own language, letters of which the names and forms were entirely foreign to them. In short, the agreement of all the ancient alphabets, among which we may likewise include the cuneiform letters of the Persians, Medes, and Assyrians, and the twenty-four radical signs of the Chinese and the Japanese, all go to confirm the tradition, according to which Noah re-arranged and transmitted the primitive alphabet. To this we must add the special historical notices among the ancient Phœnicians, Chaldeans, Greeks, &c., according to which Noah employed the alphabet to indicate the places of the seven planets in the zodiac, at the time of the flood, by means of the seven vowels of the alphabet. The alphabets of the present time contain but five or six vowels, but the ancient Egyptians had seven; and the

two vowels *e*, *e*, which were afterwards dropped, had their place, according to the ancient Arabians, next to the Hebrew *cheth*. The ancients still further specify to which particular planet each one of these seven distinct vowels respectively referred, that is, *a* to the Moon, *e* to Venus, *e* to the Sun, *e* to Mercury, *i* to Mars, *o* to Jupiter, *u* to Saturn. That the seven vowels of the Noachian alphabet, as the ancients affirm, really expressed a planetary constellation, is evident from the very fact, that those vowels which are entirely distinct from the consonants, are not put in juxtaposition, neither at the commencement, nor in the middle, nor at the end of the alphabet, but scattered, like the planets in different points of the zodiac.

Now if these traditions are correct, then the alphabet must indicate the planetary constellation at the end of the deluge, on 7th of September, 3447 B. C. For all the reliable traditions of antiquity, as we shall show hereafter, concur in bearing witness that the deluge ended in the year 3447 B. C., on the 7th day of September. If, therefore, the alphabet was, at that time, a representation of the zodiac, as Sanctionia-thon expressly says, then the twenty-five letters must be referred to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and that in such a manner, as that the first two letters are placed in Gemini, which was then the first sign of the zodiac. We thus obtain the following places of the planets: The Moon (*a*) in Gemini 0° — 15° ; Venus (*e*) in Leo 0° — 15° ; the Sun (*e*) in Virgo 15° — 30° ; Mercury (*e*) in Libra 0° — 15° ; Mars (*i*) in Scorpio 15° — 30° ; Jupiter (*o*) in Aquarius 15° — 30° ; Saturn (*u*) in Gemini 0° — 15° . This is really, as every one can find from his astronomical tables, the planetary constellation of September 7th, a. 3447 B. C.

But, it will be asked, what benefit or advantage can we derive from these ancient Asiatic, Egyptian, Greek and Roman astronomical observations, although they have thus far been entirely unknown to us? Let every one form his own judgment from what I shall now proceed to say.

XVI. DEFECTS OF THE PLANETARY TABLES.

Our planetary tables are based upon the observations of Ptolemy, A. D. 130. But as at that time there were as yet no instruments for making astronomical measurements, these observations of Ptolemy must necessarily contain errors, and these increase considerably in importance, as we go back towards earlier dates. We are now acquainted with planetary

places and constellations which, among the Romans, are eight hundred, among the Greeks nine hundred, among the Egyptians three thousand years older than those of Ptolemy, by means of which our planetary tables can be corrected. They furnish us, in repeated instances, with coincident, though not very important, deviations from the ancient observations; and we have thus been already enabled to show, that the mean motions of the planets, their anomalies, nodes and apogees, differed in some degree from those assumed in the tables constructed on the basis of Ptolemy's observations. It is, therefore, to be hoped that astronomers by profession, will make themselves acquainted with the astronomy of the ancient Egyptians.

XVII. THE HISTORY OF EGYPT.

The celebrated Lepsius, of Berlin, has, in his great work on the history of Egypt, made the immortal discovery, that Menes, the first king of the country, reigned before our dates of the flood and of the creation; that "the deluge was confined to but a small portion of the globe;" that "the sacred scriptures contain no history;" that "the chronology of the Bible must accommodate itself to that of the Egyptians (as interpreted by Mr. Lepsius)," &c. This great Savant, however, has exhibited in all his writings, to the present day, such a degree of ignorance, heedlessness, and levity, that there is no need of any refutation of his chimeras. Mr. Lepsius has not even learnt, as yet, that all great kingdoms or empires have originated in smaller ones, that consequently also Manetho's dynasties must, from the very beginning, have been contemporaneous. The whole history of Egypt is now determined, even to minute dates of years and days, by means of the many planetary constellations mentioned above, as having occurred at the birth of the Pharaohs, at the commencement of the said four ages of the world, and at the beginning of the reign of Menes, by means of the transits of Mercury connected with the reign of certain monarchs, and lastly, by means of the phoenix-periods and apis-periods, concerning which we have already spoken. On the basis of these mathematical truths we, in the first place, find the commencement of the reign of Thuthmoses, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, during which the Hebrews emigrated, to have been in the year 1904 B. C. On the 7th April, of the same year, there was a renewal of the phoenix-period of six hundred and fifty-one years, which is said to have taken place

in the reign of this very Shuthmoses, or Amos I., and in the sixth year of the emperor Claudius. The arrival of the shepherd-kings (hyksos) i. e. the Hebrews, as Josephus testifies, is ascertained with equal certainty. Even Manetho states, that these hyksos became the founders of Jerusalem subsequently to their expulsion from Egypt, and according to Africanus' copy of Manetho, they ruled contemporaneously with the Diospolite kings of the seventeenth dynasty, that is to say, in their land of Goshen. The Hebrews, therefore, arrived in Egypt, according to Manetho, in the seven hundredth year of the canicular period, consequently in 2082 B. C. The precise time of Sesostris the Great, of the twelfth dynasty, is determined by the circumstance, that during his reign, and on the 6th of April a. 2555 B. C., those phoenix-periods of six hundred and fifty-one years commenced, which were subsequently renewed in 1904 B. C., under Amos I., and in 50 A. D., under Claudius. The first year of Menes, namely the 2781st B. C., is determined by sixteen astronomical inscriptions, and by the fact, that the *vetus chronicon*, an old historical work of the Egyptians, places Menes in the first year of the canicular period, that is, likewise in 2781 B. C. Thus it is evident that between Menes and the eighteenth dynasty, several dynasties must have ruled simultaneously in upper and lower Egypt, which was early divided into twelve provinces, or *Nomi*. The question now is, which of these were contemporaneous? Erastosthenes has left us a translation of a list of the Pharaohs, from Menes to the end of the eighteenth dynasty (1647 B. C.), together with a statement of the years of the respective reigns of these kings, and from these it is manifest, not only that Menes did not come from Babylonia into Egypt, until the said year 2781 B. C., but also that among the earlier dynasties, enumerated by Manetho, the I, XII, XVI, XVII, XVIII only were successive, and that the intervening ones were contemporaneous with them. The same Egyptian history is established with still greater certainty, by the table of Abydos, of the year 1600 B. C., in which all the Egyptian kings of the 1st, 12th, 16th, 17th and 18th dynasties are enumerated in their regular order, but all the intervening ones entirely omitted. Finally, we have, in addition, the table of Karnac, of the year 1700 B. C., which divides the kings, from Menes to the eighteenth dynasty, into two series, by arranging those that ruled successively on one side, and those who were their contemporaries, on the other. Thus then, the strife which has lasted

so many years, respecting Manetho's dynasties, and the true commencement of Egyptian history, has at last been set at rest. The history of Egypt did not begin before the year 2781 B. C. It is true, that men may differ in opinion, but astronomical and mathematical facts can never be controverted.

Our next inquiry is, what may have been the date which the Egyptians assigned to the creation and the deluge? The day of creation was, according to their traditions, the day of the vernal equinox, as Philo and the church fathers testify. The said planetary constellation of the commencement of the first age of the world, also preserved by the Egyptians, refers us, as we have already shown, to the same day, 5871 B. C.

Furthermore, they placed the creation in the year in which Sirius, the dog-star, rose with the sun, on the day of the vernal equinox, as we are informed by Porphyry, by Aeneas, by Gazaus, and others. And this again, could take place only in the year 5871 B. C. Lastly, we find it stated by the Alexandrian astronomer, Theon, that in the year 27 B. C., the sixteenth of the reign of Augustus, on the 29th of August (the 1st of the month Thoth) a new canicular period (the fifth since the creation, comprising fourteen hundred and sixty-one years) had commenced; by which 5871 B. C., is again confirmed as the year of the creation. In short, the Egyptians, like all the other nations of antiquity, have assigned 5871 B. C. as the year of the creation. The history of the deluge they represented by the myth concerning the death of Osiris, which occurred on the same day, the 17th of the month Athyr, on which the deluge began, according to the sacred scriptures.

But how does this agree with Manetho and the *vetus chronicon*, which reckon three thousand years from the beginning to Typhon, the murderer of his brother Osiris (i. e. the flood, for Typhon signifies also the sea, as Osiris the mainland) and farther 3984 years, from thence to Menes, and besides 217 additional years? We are informed by Censorinus Horapollon and others, that the Egyptian word *abot*, *babot* (complexus) signified not only a year, but also a month, and also a season of two months. Consequently, Manetho and the author of the *vetus chronicon*, were authorized to calculate times according to such shorter years, without contradicting the other historical traditions of their nation. Now we know, more-

over, that Manetho's history of Egypt was called the book of the Sothis, that is to say, the book of the great canicular period of 36525 years. This number was obtained by the multiplication of the smaller Sothis of 1461 years with the Apis-period of twenty-five years, and proximately coincided, as we have seen, with the great world-period of thirty-six thousand years. Now since Manetho was acquainted with the very year of the creation, 5871, which was recorded in the planetary constellations concerning the commencement of the ages of the world, he must have taken shorter years as the basis of those periods, in order to include in his great Sothis of 36525 years, the entire history of Egypt, down to his time. In short, for the purpose of establishing a history of 36525 years, called Sothis, Manetho turned solar years into months, by multiplication, as we find it also among the ancient Chaldeans, Hindus, Chinese and others. He therefore regarded those three thousand years of his from the creation to the flood, as so many lunar months, and consequently reckoned only 2424 solar years for the period in question. Moreover, the 3984 years (Horae) from the deluge to Menes, of which each expressed a season of two months, give but six hundred and sixty-four solar years, and Manetho's third period of two hundred and seventeen years, rather comprises the days from Menes' departure to his arrival in Egypt. Hence there is nothing at all irreconcilable between Manetho's Sothis and the other traditions of his people. All knew that, according to the above-mentioned planetary constellations, the creation had taken place on the 10th of May 5871 A. C., and the arrival of Menes, on the 16th of July, 2781 A. C. Between the two epochs 3089 years intervene, and precisely this number we have in Manetho's periods of 30,000 months and 3984 Horae with 217 days. In fine, as Manetho reckons from the creation down to Typhon (the deluge) 2424 solar years, the Egyptians placed the flood 2424 years subsequent to 5871 A. C., and therefore in the year 3447 A. C., to which year, as has already been said, the planetary constellation in the alphabet refers.

XVIII. THE PYRAMID OF CHEOPS.

To the most remarkable among the antiquities in Dr. Abbott's museum, belongs a heavy gold signet-ring (No. 1050), bearing upon it the name of King Cheops. This was the king who, according to Herodotus, built the great pyramid at Gizeh; and his name has actually been found in a chamber

of this pyramid. But at what precise time may this wonder of the world have been erected? Mr. Lepsius places the pyramid before the flood, and even before the creation: this coming from such an illustrious philosopher, does not surprise us at all. Yet it will be well to hear what Herodotus, whom Mr. Lepsius does not name, has to say on the subject. Herodotus, Book II. c. 99, mentions all the particularly remarkable kings, from Menes (2781 A. C.) down to his own time. Among those who succeeded Menes, the more remarkable were Moeris, the ninth king of the eighteenth dynasty, 1777 A. C.; after him, his son Sesostris (Osimandya) 1731 A. C.; then Pheran (Ramses the great) 1692 A. C.; then Proteus, at the time of the Trojan war; then Rhampsinit; then Cheops; then Chephren; next Mykerinos; next Asychis, and so on. Thus, then, the erection of the great pyramid long subsequent to the end of the eighteenth dynasty, the period of which is determined by reliable astronomical observations: nay, its date is later even than that of the Trojan war, which, according to the unanimous testimony of antiquity, took place about twelve hundred years A. C. During this time, Egypt was governed by the kings of the twentieth dynasty, whose names the transcribers of Manetho have unfortunately not preserved. In short, the pyramid of Cheops was not built before the creation and the flood, but as late as the period of the twentieth dynasty, later than the fall of Troy, and in the time of David.

XIX. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The currently received chronology of the Old Testament is based upon the "*Doctrina Temporum*," Paris A. D. 1627, of Petavius. But this unfortunate chronologist adopted, as the basis of his scheme, not the correct statement of the Greek text, but the falsified numbers of the Hebrew, which shortens the period from the creation to Abraham by fifteen hundred years. Petavius might, and ought to have known, as well as Perizonius (*l'Antiquite des temps*, Paris 1687), that after the destruction of Jerusalem, a certain Rabbi, Akiba, shortened the chronological statements in the Hebrew text, by fifteen hundred years, for the purpose of making Christ appear to have been a false Messiah, who had come so many years before the predicted time: Petavius ought to have known, that, according to the present reckoning in the Hebrew text, Methuselah and Lamech must have survived the flood; that Christ, the apostles, the first christian church-

es, and all the eastern churches of the present day, nay even the Jew Josephus, never knew of any other chronology of time than that of the LXX; that even the Arabians bear witness to that intentional corruption; and that the Jews in Ethiopia have retained, down to the present day, a biblical history, longer by fifteen hundred years, than that of the present Hebrew text. However, even the Greek version of the Old Testament, made two hundred and fifty years before Christ, has, like all other ancient manuscripts, suffered from the carelessness of transcribers, so that we find mistakes in two passages. According to the book of Judges, which states the years during which nearly all the judges governed Israel, according to Josephus, and according to the genealogies of the Old Testament, as even Prichard, *Egyptian Mythology*, London 1816, already showed, it was eight hundred and eighty years from the Exode of the Hebrews out of Egypt, down to the building of Solomon's temple. The Greek text, 1 Kings 6: 1, makes it only four hundred and forty years, and the Hebrew four hundred and eighty. This then would make the date of Israel's exode four hundred years earlier than Petavius would have us believe, i. e., in the year 1867 A. C. This correction of the biblical reckoning is established beyond all possibility of doubt, by a great number of mathematical and historical facts. Clemens Alexandrinus states that the Israelites emigrated five hundred and forty-five years before the beginning of the new canicular period, which began 1322 before Christ, consequently in the year above mentioned, 1867 before Christ. Manetho informs us that the shepherd kings (Hyksos), who, according to him and Josephus, were the Israelites, had come to Egypt seven hundred years after the beginning of the first Sothic canicular period, beginning 2782 before Christ, therefore in the year 2082 A. C. Now, as they departed again two hundred and fifteen years later, it is again obvious that the year 1867 before Christ was the year of their departure. This occurred, as is testified by ecclesiastical antiquity, under Amos I, king of the eighteenth dynasty; but this king reigned, as is shown by the planetary constellations of his successors, and the transit of Mercury, which occurred 1904 A. C., during his reign, from the year 1904 to the year 1867 A. C., when he perished in the Red Sea. Joseph was, according to ecclesiastical traditions, sold into Egypt during the reign of Apophis (2105 A. C.), and twenty-three years later the Israelites came to Goshen: and this again proves that their exode oc-

curred 1867 A. C. Josephus and the ancient Commentaries on Numbers 24: 17, inform us that three years before the birth of Moses, a remarkable conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter occurred in the sign Pisces, which takes place, according to Kepler, only once in eight hundred years. But the only time when this can have occurred, is 1951 before Christ, whence Moses was born 1948 A. C. But as Moses was, at the time of the exode, eighty years old, it is again obvious that this exode must have occurred 1867 A. C. Furthermore, the scriptures reckon from the flood, which ended on the 7th day of September, down to the exode, 1580 years. Now it has been ascertained that, according to the planetary constellation contained in the alphabet, the deluge came to an end on the 7th of September, 3447 A. C., hence, once again, the Israelites must have made their exode 1867 A. C. In short, from the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt, down to the building of Solomon's temple, a period elapsed, not of 440, or of 480, but of 880 years.

The second mistake made by teanscribers of the Greek text, is found in Genesis 5: 25, 26; this appears already from the different readings, and the contradctetions that have grown out of them. If, at the birth of Lamech, Methuselah had been only one hundred and sixty-seven or one hundred and eighty-seven years old, he would have survived the deluge. But if we read three hundred and forty-nine years, his death occurred 168 years before the flood. This being correct, a period not of 2242 or 2262, but of 2424 years intervened between the creation and the flood. In this way the history of the Old Testament is again reconciled with itself, with the historical traditions current among all the other ancient nations, and, what is in itself decisive, with the ages of the world and the astronomical traditions of all the nations of antiquity. For, from the planetary constellation at the beginning of the first age of the world, on the 10th of May, 5871 A. C., down to the constellation at the end of the deluge, on the 7th of September 3447 A. C., we again have 2424 years. It has been ascertained that the Egyptians also reckoned, from the beginning of time to the death of Osiris by Typhon, i. e. to the deluge, 30,000 lunar months, hence 2424 years. All ancient nations, and even Habakkuk and Daniel reckoned 6000 years from the creation to Tiberius and Christ. So definite a history of the Old Testament, accurately fixing not only years, but days, would never have come to light, had not the hand of Providence preserved for us so

many antiquities of Egypt, together with so many astronomical observations from the time of the Roman emperors back to the day of creation. The beginning of the first age of the world, according to the Julian year, that 10th of May, 5871 A. C., was really, as the traditions of the ancient nations reported, the day of the vernal equinox, and, at the same time, the first Sabbath.

XX. THE HISTORY OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS.

The computation of time, as respects the history of the Greeks and Romans, at present universally in use, has also been derived from Petavius, but also contains, as is well known, the greatest contradictions and incongruities: the last demonstration of this will be found in the chronological tables of Clinton and Fischer. Thus, according to Grecian chronology, as given by Petavius, the Olympic games occurred in years differing from those obtained by means of his Roman chronology: a great number of eclipses of the sun and the moon, which the historians place in the years of particular consuls and archons, occurred, according to the reckoning of Petavius, a year or two later than is affirmed by annalists and eye-witnesses, and Petavius even pretended that many of them had been supernatural phenomena. All these contradictions and mathematical impossibilities have now also been rectified by means of Egyptian, Greek and Roman astronomical observations, and through the Apis-periods and the reappearances of the Phoenix. Petavius has, in his heedlessness, had the misfortune to take the consuls of 47 and 78. P. C., namely, L. Cocceius Commodus, associated with D. Novius Priscus, and Rufus associated with Silvanus, for ordinarii, whereas they were mere consules suffecti, or extraordinarii, as might, and ought to have been ascertained from the Roman inscriptions and coins. Petavius, assigning to each of those consuls two entire years, inserted them in the succession of the ordinary consuls, and hence dated all their predecessors, consequently also the whole Roman and Grecian history, too far back, from Titus to Claudius by one year, and from Claudius backward, by two years. One example will elucidate this sufficiently. On account of the consuls inserted in the years 47 and 78 P. C., Petavius was obliged to place Cæsar's death in the year 44 instead of 42 A. C. In the same year the Julian calendar was introduced, and its 1st of January, as we learn from the historians, and from the Julian coins, struck at the same time, began on the day of a new moon.

But in the year 44 the new moon occurred twenty days later; and only in the year 42 A. C., the new moon appeared on the 1st of January. The last lunar year of the Romans must, for the very reason that it was a lunar year, have begun with a new moon. This last lunar year of the Romans, consisting of 445 days, had commenced, as is well known, on the 13th of Octobea. But neither in 46 nor in 47, and not until 44 A. C., did a new moon occur on the 13th of October; again, therefore, two years later. The historians relate that, on the night preceding Cæsar's assassination, Calpurnia was awakened by the light of the full moon: another impossibility for Petavius to dispose of; for not until 42 A. C., was the moon full in the night from the 14th to the 15th of March. A short time before Cæsar's death, the Romans witnessed a total eclipse of the moon; but this could have occurred on the 13th of March only in the year 42 A. C. In short, Petavius has incorrectly inserted the consuls in 47 and 78 P. C., and Cæsar's death did not occur in the year 44, but not until 42 A. C. Besides this, we know that in the month of July next following Cæsar's death, the Olympic games were celebrated. Now, as these did not occur in 44, but as late as 42 A. C., all Grecian history, as arranged by Petavius, must move down two years. This appears already from the aforementioned planetary constellation at the beginning of the Olympiads, which occurred, not 780, but 778 A. C. For the Olympiads, as all the eras of the ancients, began with nought. Not until the close of the first Olympiad events were for example, dated thus: Ol. I. year 2d. Thus, then, the second Olympiad began, not 776 but 774 A. C. By means of these corrections in Grecian history, two other facts of great importance have come to light: these facts, namely, that the Greeks and the Hebrews computed time, not by lunar months, but by fixed solar months. As respects the Greeks, this was maintained already by Scaliger, Clinton, and many others, but who were prevented, by the confusion which Petavius had introduced in Grecian history, from proving what they asserted, or giving a correct view of the solar calendar of the Greeks, which even Halma found in an ancient manuscript. The months Gimelion and Apellæus have always commenced on the 4th of December according to the Julian year. That the Hebrews reckoned, until after the destruction of Jerusalem, by fixed solar months of thirty days, we learn from Josephus, the earlier Rabbis, many passages of the Old Testament, and the dates of the Jewish Sabbaths

assigned to certain days of the month. The first day of the month Nisan, of the ecclesiastical year, began on the 6th of March, Julian time. With the aid of these two calendars, all the dates of Hebrew and Grecian history have now been definitely traced to distinct days of our own reckoning, with which they precisely correspond.

XXI. THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

For a long series of years it has been very generally believed and taught, that Christ did not appear in the sixth year thousand, had not been announced, or born, or baptized, or crucified, or raised from the dead, in the years or days, foretold by the prophets, testified by the evangelists, and believed by the primitive christian churches. All the formerly received epochs of the New Testament have been transferred to other years and days: and for what purpose? In order to reduce the New Testament to a "myth."

We are to consider christianity under three distinct aspects, the historical, the dogmatical and the ethical. Historical christianity forms the basis of the christian faith and christian love. For, suppose it were true that the prophets, the apostles and their disciples, the early church-fathers, were mistaken respecting the historical groundwork of the New Testament: then, of course, not the slightest credence would be due to them in respect of all other matters; and therefore the structure of the christian church would, sooner or later, have to crumble into ruin. This the enemy has clearly perceived, and therefore he began with undermining the basis of the christian church, historical christianity. Let us be thankful to God that, by means of the new historical and chronological aids which have been specified, we are now enabled to demonstrate the correctness of the dates, both as to years and days, of all the New Testament epochs, without exception, transmitted to us by the church.

Everybody knows that the christian era begins with the 1st of January next following the birth of Christ; that is, with the year which the astronomers designate with nought. If from the 1st of January of the current year, 1856, we count back 1856 entire years, we arrive at what has just been stated to be the beginning of the christian era. This is the order fixed, 625 P. C., by Dionysius Exiguus, the originator of our era, or method of computing time since the birth of Christ, for his calculations of the Easter full moons for the entire christian era, are still extant. He places the first Eas-

ter festival after the birth of Christ in the year nought. It is, indeed, the opinion of many, that, according to Dionysius, the current year is the 1856th, and not the 1857th; but they have forgotten the easter-canon of Dionysius, and neglected to consider that all the eras of the ancients began with a year nought, and had, of necessity, to begin in this way, in order that no ambiguities might arise. In like manner the first hour after noon begins at the moment when the clock strikes twelve; but it does not strike one until sixty minutes later, when the second hour after noon commences. The current century began, therefore, not on the first of January 1801, but on the same day of 1800. And now let us inquire, whether the New Testament is really a "fable."

The first point that is fully confirmed is, that Christ came into the world in that century which is foretold by the prophet Habakkuk, chap. 3, v. 2. For, "the midst of the years" was, according to all the ancient nations, the middle of a period of twelve thousand years; whence, also the Greeks and the Romans expected the Redeemer of the world at the time of Augustus. Now, as all the astronomical traditions of antiquity, and especially the Old Testament, place the creation in the year 5871 A. C., Christ really came into the world "in the fulness of time," in the sixth year thousand [millennium]. The Jews, with their corrupt chronology, have no authority whatever to be still looking for the Messiah.

Furthermore, Christ was born, as is stated by Luke, in a census-year. A census of this kind was, at that time, taken every seven years (*lustra*). Now since the years of Augustus, move down, as we have seen, two years, one census under Augustus occurred in the year 9 A. C., another in the year 6 P. C.

Hence it follows that also in the year 1 B. C., such a census was taken, although it is not mentioned by any of the Roman authors that have come down to us. Christ was really born during the first census of Quirinus.

Herod is known to have died three months after the birth of Christ, and according to the account of Josephus, two months after an eclipse of the moon. Now since the years of his reign, which were linked to those of Augustus, are likewise brought nearer to us by two years, and since the lunar eclipse in question can have taken place only on the 9th of January of the year 0 (nought) A. C., therefore Christ must have been born shortly before the commencement of our era.

From Josephus, and from the Rabinical commentaries on Numbers 24: 15, it appears, that three years and some months before the birth of Moses, a remarkable conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in the sign of Pisces, had taken place, which really did occur in the year 1951 B. C.; and that a similar conjunction was to occur three entire years previous to the birth of the Messiah. In fact, such a conjunction did take place in the year 4, prior to the commencement of the Dionysian era. The eastern magi, who were acquainted with this prediction, came, of course, to Herod three years after that conjunction, i. e. shortly before the commencement of the year nought, and found the child at Bethlehem: whence it is again manifest, that Christ was born shortly before the commencement of our era.

Eusebius, Tertullian, and others, place the birth of Christ in the same year. And thus the prophecy of Daniel 9: 24, has been fulfilled in every particular. For according to that remarkable prediction of the greatest of all prophets, the Savior of mankind was to come into the world in the year 532 after the Babylonian captivity, which terminated in the first year of the reign of Cyrus 534 B. C. For it must be borne in mind, that Daniel reckons his weeks by years of six, twelve, and twenty-four months, in conformity with the custom of his time, according to which the term month was applied indifferently to intervals of fifteen, thirty, and sixty days. Daniel's weeks of years are periods of seven years, computed in accordance with this manner of employing the term month. This is already made evident by the words that "Christ was to die in the middle of the week," and yet "confirm the covenant with many for one week." Daniel therefore reckons from the first year of the reign of Cyrus (534 B. C.) to the birth of our Lord, seven weeks of years consisting of years of twenty-four months each, in other words, ninety-eight ordinary years, and then again, sixty-two additional prophetic weeks, composed of years of twelve months each, in other words, four hundred and thirty-four years; which, added together, give us the sum of five hundred and thirty-two years. Now since Christ was born shortly before the commencement of the Dionysian era, he really came into the world five hundred and thirty-two years after the Babylonian captivity, as Daniel had predicted, five hundred and thirty-four years before.

The birth-day of Christ, which is the day of the winter solstice, or our 22d of December, is determined in the first

place, by the testimony of the Gnostics. For these heathen christians, who existed already before Christ, were waiting for the birth of the Savior, and have left us a multitude of monuments, some very ancient, others more recent, according to which Christ was born on the day of the winter solstice. Clemens Alexandrinus, together with the oldest and most credible fathers of the church, give their testimony in favor of the same day. The *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, moreover, assign the Savior's birth to the 25th of December, which, according to the old Julian style, was the day of the winter solstice. To this must be added the evidence afforded by the chronograph preserved in the works of Cardinal Noris, according to which, Christ was born on the day of the full moon; and the 22d of December of the year preceding the commencement of our era, was actually the day of a full moon, and a Sunday. The words of John the Baptist: "He must increase, but I must decrease," serve to prove, as is affirmed by the fathers of the church, that John was born on the longest day of the year (on the 22d of June), and Christ, who was six months younger, on the shortest, i. e. on the 22d of December. The same thing is proved by the Sacerdotal class of Abia, at the annunciation of John the Baptist. In the year 538 B. C., the Jews returned to Jerusalem, and on Saturday, the 25th of September, upon the occasion of the dedication of the new altar of sacrifice by Zerubbabel, the twenty-four classes of priests resumed once more their weekly turns of official duty, which continued until the destruction of the temple, seventy-one years after Christ. Now it was in the year 2 before the commencement of our era, on Saturday the 22d of September, that this eighth Sacerdotal class Abia, to which Zaccharias belonged, left the temple, after the birth of John the Baptist had been announced to him. Consequently John the Baptist was really born on the 22d of June, and Christ, as he was six months younger, on the 22d of December. Thus has the prophecy of Haggai, 2: 6, 7, 18, been literally fulfilled. For the 24th day of the 9th month, to which the prophet points us, was at that time the day of the winter solstice. It was on the same day that the dedications of the temple by Hezekiah and Judas Macabaeus, were typically performed.

The baptism of Christ, and the beginning of his public ministry are, first of all, determined by the testimony of St. Paul. For since the fifteenth year of Tiberius, in which the Baptist entered upon his prophetic ministry, is by our pres-

ent calculation brought down two years later, Christ must have been baptized in the twenty-ninth year after the commencement of our era, "at an age of nearly thirty," to enter forty days later, upon his ministry. On the same day, the 22d of December of the same year, Christ was thirty years of age, and as he was "born under the law," and consequently obliged to enter upon the priestly office on the first day of his thirty-first year, he must have commenced his public ministry on the 22d of December A. D. 29, and received his baptism on the 13th of November. Epiphanius specifies the 8th of November, simply because on account of the shifting of the five Epagomena, his 8th of November corresponds to our 13th. The evangelists report still further, that Christ entered upon the duties of his public ministry forty-six years after the erection of the temple of Herod. As the eighteenth year of Herod's reign, in which he laid the foundation of the temple on the 22d of March, is now brought down two years later, it again appears that Christ must have begun his public ministry A. D. 29.

The three years and some months of our Lord's public ministry, are indicated with sufficient clearness, in the parables concerning the fig-tree, and the vine-dresser, and by the four feasts of the passover, mentioned by St. John. This period is marked still more distinctly in the Apocalypse, by forty-two months, 1260 days; for, as the Hebrews always calculated by solar months of thirty days, that statement will give us exactly three years and six months. Thus then, the prophecy of Daniel, according to which Christ "was to confirm the covenant with many for one week," was literally fulfilled; for exactly three years and six months, or forty-two months, or 1260 days elapsed from the baptism of Christ to the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the first christian feast of Pentecost. This prophetic week of Daniel was, as we have already shown, composed of months of fifteen days, consequently of years of six solar months, of which seven make exactly three and a half of our ordinary years.

The year of the death of Christ, A. D. 33, is, in the first place, determined by the years of his public ministry, and of his birth. For since our Lord was baptized in the fifteenth year of Tiberius (29 A. D.) "at the age of nearly thirty," and then preached the Gospel during three and a half years, he must have died A. D. 33, or in the eighteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. The same year of Tiberius is named as that of the death of Christ, by the *Martyrologium Pauli*, by

Eusebius, Epiphanius, Prosperus, Matata, by the chronicon paschale and others. And thus has the prophecy of Daniel again been fulfilled. For he reckoned from the Babylonian captivity (534 B. C.) to the year in which Christ shall be cut off, and not be according to the Hebrew text, an interval of twenty weeks of fourteen years each (i. e. 280 years), forty weeks of seven years each (i. e. again 280 years), and two weeks of three and a half years each (i. e. 7 years), in all 567 years; he has consequently placed the death of Christ in the year A. D. 33.

It is well known, that the death of our Lord took place on the 14th of the month Nisan, on the day before the feast of the passover, which was called "the preparation, Parasceue," and this always corresponded, as we have already seen, with the 19th of the Julian March. It was on these same days of March, that the earliest christian churches, which were founded by the Apostles themselves, always observed the festival at Easter, and more particularly the Quatradecimani, the Capadocians, the Gauls and others: all place the death of Christ, the passio, by which they meant the whole space of time intervening between the crucifixion and the resurrection, upon the 19th, 20th and 21st of March. The solar eclipse of Dionysius Areopagita, confirms that as the day of Christ's death, with mathematical certainty. While travelling in Egypt and Aethiopia, this author was witness to an eclipse of the sun, at the sight of which he exclaimed: "Now the Lord is suffering something." This solar eclipse on the 14th of Nisan, i. e. on the 19th of March, could have taken place only in the year 33 after Christ; it occurred at two o'clock in the afternoon, consequently during the very same hours in which Christ expired on the cross. Christ died, therefore, precisely on the same day on which the pascal lamb had been typically slain in Egypt; that is to say, three days before the vernal equinox.

The resurrection of Christ took place, as we all know, on the following Sunday, which in the year 33 A. D., was on the 22d of March, the day of the vernal equinox. This fact is already attested by Augustine, for he says, that Christ's death or passion, occurred on the very day on which the annunciation to Mary had taken place. But the constitutiones apostolorum refer this annunciation to the day of the vernal equinox, which was at the same time a Sunday. Now this day of the vernal equinox occurred upon a Sunday only in the year preceding the commencement of our era; from which

it is again manifest that the birth-day of Christ was on the 22d of December. The resurrection therefore occurred on the very day that had already been typically sanctified by the exode out of Egypt, by the founding of the temples of Solomon and Herod, and by the dedication of Zerubbabel's temple. In like manner, the dedication of the ark of the covenant, the entry into the promised land, and the dedications of the temple of Solomon, and of the altar of Zerubbabel, had been fixed upon the day on which the birth of John the Baptist was announced, which was the 22d of September, the day of the autumnal equinox. Finally, Christ, the second Adam, rose from the dead on the very day on which, as we have already shown, the Almighty had completed the work of creation. And thus the prophecy of Daniel has likewise been fulfilled, that "Christ was to confirm the covenant with many for one week, and to be cut off in the midst of the week," as it reads in the original. For as the Hebrew year commenced on the day of the autumnal equinox, the middle of the prophetic week must have been the day of the vernal equinox, i. e. the 22d of March.

Finally, since Christ died on the 19th of March, and rose again on Sunday, the 22d of March, A. D. 33, he must have remained in the grave three days and three nights: for this 19th of March A. D. 33, was a Thursday. This is evident already, from the testimony of the evangelists. They make minute mention of all the events of the sacred week, and expressly refer Christ's death to Thursday, to the fourth day after Palm Sunday, the third before the resurrection. Thus then the typical death of Jonah, which our Savior expressly referred to himself, found here its perfect antitype. Christ was really, like Jonah, in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights.

Such, then, are some of the fruits which the antiquities of Egypt, preserved to us by Providence, have borne to us: of that Egypt, out of which God designed to call his son.

We have here a mathematically accurate confirmation of the entire Old and New Testaments, a thorough and complete rectification of the Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Greek and Roman histories and chronologies, down to Titus. And who can determine beforehand, what advantages may yet, in time to come, accrue from this source, to the christian church?

XXII. THE EGYPTIAN & HEBREW MEASURES OF CAPACITY.

Among the most remarkable curiosities of Dr. Abbott's museum, are two vessels, on which their measure of capacity

is indicated. It is known, that at the time of their departure from Egypt, the Hebrews carried with them the Egyptian weights and measures, and retained these in use until the destruction of Jerusalem. All the names of these weights and measures are known to us from ancient Egyptian, Coptic, Hebrew, and Greek authorities; but until a few years ago, no man was able to compare them with our modern measures. Attempts have been made to determine the weights of the Hebrews, and consequently those of the ancient Egyptians, by means of the Hebrew coins from the time of the Maccabees. The result, however, is still an uncertain one, and the weights preserved in Dr. Abbott's museum may perhaps help to shed some additional light upon the subject. Since the five cubit measures have been found in the catacombs, we are, as they give all the Egyptian measures of length, with their names, down to the sixteenth part of an inch, in possession of an accurate criterion for determining the Hebrew and Egyptian method of measuring lengths. But the solid and liquid measures of the Hebrews and Egyptians, are yet wrapped in impenetrable darkness. Every conceivable method has been devised, in order to determine the capacity of the Hebrew liquid measures; for instance, that of the brazen sea in the temple of Solomon; but the results reached are utterly unsatisfactory. Dr. Abbott's museum is now the only one in the world, by means of which the subject in question can be settled. The carefully executed measure, No. 389 of the collection, contains the number 19; probably because it was capable of holding 19 Hins, which in Egypt and Palestine was the most commonly in use, and was equivalent to about a pint of our measure. In the same manner, the larger amphora, No. 6, contains, as a friend discovered, the number 4, probably because its capacity was equal to that of 4 Egyptian amphorae. But it will be said, that these are matters of trifling consequence. It is true, they may be so, but it is well known that important truths have often been brought to light by apparent trifles.

XXIII. THE ABRAXAS.

I take the liberty, in conclusion, of mentioning signet-stones (Nos. 969 and 971), which were worn by Gnostic christians. The name Abraxas or Abrasax, contains as Mather has first shown, the number 365, according to the numerical value of the Greek letters; hence the number of the days of the year, and thus, the Lord of the year, or of time.

The Gnostics considered Christ as the promised Savior of the world; but their creed contained an admixture of a variety of pagan superstitions, and this accounts for the peculiar character of these Abraxas stones. The specimens in Dr. Abbott's museum belong to the most important monuments of the kind; they were entirely unknown to Mather, and afford a good deal of new and important information respecting the sect of the Gnostics. No. 969 is remarkable, from the fact that it presents the image of Christ with pagan insignia, and holding two phoenixes in its hands. We learn from the fathers of the church, and from Münter, that the phoenix was a christian symbol, probably because the phoenix (or Mercury) had made its transit over the sun, in the month of October, at the beginning of the Hebrew year, immediately after the birth of Christ, and after his resurrection, and had thus marked the resurrection and the commencement of a new era. The Abraxas No. 971 exhibits an entirely new representation of Christ, and besides, four remarkable inscriptions, which although they offer many difficulties to the translator, on account of the corrupt Coptic and Greek terms contained in them, are yet susceptible of an appropriate rendering. Christ's image is a God with a lion's head, with the ansated cross in his right hand, a sceptre in the left, and the sun disk surrounded by the snake Uracus on his head. These symbols phonetically denote the Lofty one, the Prince, the mighty one, the Lord, by their Coptic names. Underneath, we find the inscription: "To the illustrious one." To the right of the figure, we find the words: "Great is Osiris, greater the sun, the light, the fire, the flame; but the greatest of all is Horus (Christ), born in humility, but greatly exalted." On the reverse we read: "I will praise him who possesses a dwelling at Leontopolis, who is surrounded by the Holy of Holies, the Lord of lightning and of thunder, of the storm and of the winds, to whom belongeth the heavenly government of everlasting nature." Around the circumference of the edge we perceive the words: "Thou art the guide that came from the sun, the God of Glory, lion-shaped, incomparable to all eternity." The Jews had a temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, which was constructed after the model of Solomon's at Jerusalem, and destroyed in the same year with that of Herod, in A. D. 71. Now as our Abraxas alludes to the resurrection of Christ, and to the temple in question as still existing, it must be referred to the time between the resurrection of Christ, 33 A. C., and the destruction of the temple, seventy-one years after Christ.

ARTICLE III.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

XXIII.

MICHAEL J. STECK.

"We gaze around,
We read their monuments: we sigh; and while
We sigh, we sink; and are what we deplor'd;
Lamenting, or lamented, all our lot!"

AMONG the good whom the year 1848 numbered with the dead, the name of Michael J. Steck will long be affectionately remembered and pronounced with reverence and love. Many years must elapse, before his beloved memory and blessed labors will be forgotten, especially by those who acknowledge him as their spiritual father, and who first learned from his lips the way of eternal life. As long as exalted worth and devoted piety awaken admiration, so long will his virtues be held in regard, and his example commended for imitation!

The subject of our sketch was born in Greensburg, Pa., May 1st, 1793. He was the son of Rev. John M.* and Esther Steck, who early dedicated their child to God in the Sacrament of Baptism, and faithfully endeavored to bring him up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. Their efforts were accompanied with the reward promised by Him, who is presented in his word as "keeping covenant and mercy with them that love Him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations." "From a child" Michael "knew the holy Scriptures," and seemed to love God and every thing good. At an early age he renewed the vows, assumed for him in infancy, by the rite of Confirmation, according to the practice of the Lutheran church, and to this solemn period of his life he often referred, as an occasion of peculiar interest, and rich spiritual blessing to his soul. As he advanced in years he grew in piety, and "increased in favor with God and man." He was regarded as a youth of unusual promise, and

* Rev. John M. Steck was a pastor of the Lutheran church for a period of nearly fifty years, the last thirty-eight of which he had charge of the congregations of Greensburg and its vicinity. He died July 14th, 1830, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

the same excellencies which distinguished his subsequent career, shone forth in his life at this early period. He was remarkably steady in his habits, and entirely free from the waywardness and folly, so prevalent at this critical age. He was always most careful in the selection of his companions, keeping himself aloof from the vicious and the corrupt, and thus he escaped the pernicious rock upon which the bark of many, that bade fair, has stranded. He also seemed fond of books, and early evinced a taste for literary pursuits. His father therefore determined to furnish him with the facilities for acquiring an education, and accordingly sent him to the Greensburg Academy, where he continued for several years, in the prosecution of his studies. Having passed over the usual curriculum, he now, in reliance upon Divine aid, resolves to devote himself to the ministry of reconciliation, and to labor for the salvation of souls. He begins at once the study of Theology, under the direction of his father, who was, at the time, pastor of the United Lutheran churches of Greensburg and the vicinity, and who for nearly forty years ministered to congregations scattered over a large region of the country. His time was, however, so completely occupied with his pastoral duties, as to afford little leisure for giving instruction to his son, who consequently removed to Pittsburg, and continued his studies with Rev. Jacob Sehnee, then pastor of the German church in that city. He here applied himself with great diligence and zeal to the work assigned him, and also by experience and observation, acquired knowledge which proved invaluable to him in subsequent life.

In the Spring of 1816 he presented himself as an applicant for licensure before the Synod of Pennsylvania, then assembled in Philadelphia, and after sustaining the usual examination, was invested with the sacred office. On his return home, he immediately commenced to preach the Gospel, and, for a season, voluntarily aided his father, whose pastoral charge covered so large space of territory, by performing services in the most remote parts of his diocese. Whilst he was engaged in this work, it was that he received and accepted a call to Lancaster, Ohio, which was, at the time, considered one of the most important fields of labor in our western church. He entered upon his duties December 15th, 1816, with fear and trembling, so low an estimate did he place upon his own qualifications for the work, so deep was his sense of the responsible vocation which was to claim his attention. His introductory sermon he preached from the words: "Now then we are

ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." The choice of his theme on this occasion, may serve to give us some idea of the views he entertained in reference to the work to which he had consecrated himself, and of the evangelical spirit which marked his labors from the very beginning. He always seemed to keep before him the great object of the ministry, and continually strove to bring souls "unto the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus." In this sphere of usefulness, Mr. Steck labored for twelve years indefatigably, and with the most gratifying evidences of success. He was the pastor, not only of the congregation in Lancaster, in which he officiated in English as well as German, but also of several churches in the neighborhood. Such was the difficulty at that day of procuring the services of a minister of the Gospel, that often a charge included more than a dozen congregations. In addition to the regular labors devolving upon him, Mr. Steck frequently, by appointment of Synod, performed itinerant missionary service, making extensive tours, and sometimes even to the very frontiers of civilization, gathering together our scattered members, and dispensing to them the word and the ordinances. Many who had wandered from the fold, and become remiss in the discharge of their religious duties, were reclaimed, and restored to the communion of the church, whilst others who had long been deprived of the means of grace, were cheered and strengthened in their christian course. Churches were planted in the wilderness; they were watered by his care; the solitary place was gladdened, and the desert made to blossom, and he rejoiced that his labors were not in vain. Greatly beloved by his own people, and enjoying the regard of the whole community, he wielded an influence as extended as it was deserving. He cordially reciprocated the attachment, and it was one of the severest trials of his life to separate from those, among whom he had so pleasantly labored for the space of twelve years. Nothing could have prompted his decision, but an imperative obligation to a beloved parent, whose declining years he felt bound to relieve of their onerous duties. In allusion to his removal from the endeared scenes of his early labors, he thus speaks: "Here my official acts in Lancaster, and the congregations connected with it, cease! These last days were to me days of mourning, for it caused me the greatest pain to leave these churches! While life lasts, I shall never forget my separation from this people. I feel

grateful that they are provided with a faithful pastor, who I hope will labor among them with greater success than I did. O that God would richly bless him and them, and grant them abundant grace."

The remainder of Mr. Steck's life was passed at Greensburg. On the death of his father, in 1830, he assumed the duties of the whole charge, and continued them without interruption, until the termination of his active and useful life. Some idea may be gathered of his labors, when it is stated that he ministered regularly to eleven churches, besides preaching at three or four stations, some of which were distant thirty miles from his place of residence. His Journal, for the space of nineteen years, exhibits a succession of pastoral duty in his numerous congregations, scarcely credible to one unacquainted with his active ministry. Earnestly and faithfully devoted to the flock entrusted to his care, he was ever ready to labor for their good. "Though blessed with a strong constitution and vigorous health, the duties of his widely extended parish were so excessive, that at times he often sank under their burden. This was especially the case the last few years of his life, when the long rides on horseback were peculiarly trying, and the infirmities of age were beginning to be felt. Returning from his distant churches, exhausted with frequent preaching and fatigue, and hoping to find a little rest in the bosom of his family, messengers from remote congregations were often in waiting, to accompany him to the bed of sickness or the house of mourning. And nowhere was the kindness of his nature, or his high sense of ministerial fidelity, more strikingly displayed, than on occasions like these. Weary and exhausted as he might be, he never refused the calls of mercy, and taking a fresh horse, he would at once turn away from home and all its sweet attractions. Venerated man! No wonder that the widow's heart leaped for joy, and the sorrowful felt a sweet relief, and the dying saint revived again, as thy feet entered the abode of suffering. Thy tender sympathy was too real, not to shed its balsam on the bruised heart, and the consolations of thy lips were as life to the departing soul."*

When the subject of our narrative was finally arrested in his course, by the hand of malignant disease, he was actively engaged in the discharge of his ministerial labors, attending

* Rev. W. A. Passavant, to whom we are indebted for many of the facts presented in this sketch.

to the spiritual wants of the sick and dying, and furnishing them with the comforts of the Gospel. He was himself attacked with typhoid fever, during the prevalence of the epidemic, and after lingering on his sick couch for several weeks, and often enduring the most acute suffering, he was released from his tenement of clay, and entered into his eternal rest.

It is an interesting spectacle to see how the christian dies, to witness in his last moments, the influence of the principles he professed in life. Then, as the individual stands upon the threshold of eternity, there is usually no concealment of character—no disposition manifested to practice deception, or to disguise one's real sentiments.

"A death-bed's a detector of the heart."

Then is seen the power of the Gospel, in sustaining and strengthening the individual for his last conflict, in taking away the sting of death, and robbing the grave of its victory. It enables him triumphantly to exclaim in apostolic language: "Thanks be to God, who giveth *me* the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Mr. Steck approached his end without any feeling of trepidation. He knew in whom he had believed, and he was assured that his confidence had not been misplaced. On one occasion he inquired of the attending physician in reference to his condition, and finding him unwilling to reply, he said: "Do not think it will alarm me—I am not afraid to die!" Although for the sake of his family, and for the church, he at times expressed a wish to live, yet he would often break forth into strong desires to depart. His words were, "How long, dear Savior—O! how long must I stay here? Come, come quickly—do come." Animated by a bright and cheering hope, he spoke of the peace, the perfect peace that reigned in his soul, of the joy that was set before him, and on which he was so soon to enter. He calmly closed his eyes on earth, and went to sit down with the glorified Redeemer on his own throne, even as he, when he had overcome, sat down with the Father on his throne.

On the day following, he was borne from his home to the grave, and immense multitudes flocked together, to mingle their common grief, and testify their warm affection for one whom they had loved whilst living, and whose departure from the world they greatly lamented. Religious exercises, solemn and appropriate to the occasion, were conducted by Rev. N. P. Hacke, of the German Reformed church, and Rev. Mes-

srs. W. S. Emery, J. Mechling, W. A. Passavant and J. Rugan, of the Lutheran church. Funeral sermons were also subsequently preached by several of the brethren in the country churches, formerly under the care of the deceased, and the occasion was still further improved, by Rev. W. A. Passavant, of Pittsburg, delivering a discourse in Greensburg, from the words: "And devout men carried Stephen to his grave, and made great lamentation over him." In the Lutheran burial ground of Greensburg, is to be seen a plain, simple, upright stone, set in a stone block, with the following inscription: "Here sleeps in Jesus the body of the Rev. Michael J. Steck, for nineteen years the faithful pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran churches in Greensburg and its vicinity; Born May 1, 1793—Died September 1, 1848; Aged 55 years and 4 months. 'He was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith: and much people were added unto the Lord.' Yet he might with justice have adopted the lamentation of the prophet: 'All the day long have I stretched out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God.' This stone is erected to his memory by the Pittsburg Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

In the year 1818 the subject of our memoir was united in marriage to Catharine Elizabeth, daughter of William Penn and Elizabeth Cope, who, with a large family, survives to mourn the loss of a most affectionate husband, whose memory is still fondly cherished by a large circle of most devoted friends. The fruits of this marriage were eleven children, four sons and seven daughters. Two of the daughters are the wives of Lutheran ministers, the one of Rev. J. Rugan, and the other of Rev. A. H. Waters.

In gathering material for our present sketch, we have been deeply interested in its subject. We have seen much to admire in his beautiful character, and the important services he rendered—much that calls for gratitude to Almighty God for furnishing the church with such a standard-bearer, who labored so faithfully for the advancement of its interests, and then left a name untarnished, as a rich legacy to posterity. We are not surprised at the laudatory language employed by the church papers at the time of his decease. Says one: "Long has he labored as a minister of Jesus Christ, and labored, too, with great fidelity and success. His departure to his eternal home, will be a loss to his late charge, and to the Lutheran church in general, which it will be difficult to sup-

ply." Says another: "In the death of this brother, the church has lost one of its brightest ornaments and best ministers. We have known him long, and loved him as a father. Long will his memory be cherished by the older members of the Lutheran church in this city, to whom he broke the bread of life more than thirty years ago, as a missionary. Their tears will mingle with those of his family, for the loss of a dear friend and a benefactor. But we feel that our and their loss is his gain."

Mr. Steck was a man of unsullied private character, with a good report among those that were without, as well as among those that were within. He was distinguished for the kindness of his heart and the gentleness of his nature. His cheerful visage, his mild and winning virtues, his engaging manners and popular address, secured for him the warm and unfeigned regard of all who came within the reach of his personal influence. In his intercourse with others, he was modest and unostentatious, evincing a low estimate of himself and his abilities. He was frank, honest and sincere, and his simplicity threw a lustre over his whole character. He was patient and forgiving, willing to suffer wrong rather than resent an injury, that peace might be promoted. He seemed to act upon the principle of "giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blamed."

As a christian, his character was rendered still more attractive. His piety was deep, sincere and consistent. It was seen in his private walk and conversation, it was manifest in his public ministrations, in his daily intercourse with the world. He adorned "the doctrine of God, our Savior in all things." He confided in God, trusted in his promises, depended not on his own strength, but on the strength of the arm of God. He was "steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." He seemed to grow in grace from day to day, and to ripen for heaven. His path was "as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

Mr. Steck united the qualifications of a good preacher and a successful pastor in more than a common degree. His appearance in the pulpit was very prepossessing. His enunciation was distinct, his voice melodious, his manner natural, animated and impressive. His style was simple and practical, his matter deeply evangelical, and his appeals to the sinner most affectionate and earnest. He meekly but faithfully preached Christ and him crucified. The last discourse he

delivered was based on the text: "Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God, over one sinner that repenteth." The services of the sanctuary he conducted with the greatest solemnity. He was never irreverent—he never introduced anything into the pulpit, unbecoming the place or the occasion.

Mr. Steck, in his preparations for the pulpit, is said to have been careful and laborious. He was a diligent student of the Bible. The views of divine truth he presented, were clear and discriminating. The large number of manuscript sketches and sermons, which are still in the possession of his friends, affords ample proof of his unwearied and successful efforts to instruct and edify those over whom he had been set as a watchman in Zion.

As a pastor he was faithful and zealous. His whole time seemed consecrated to the spiritual improvement of his people. During the thirty-two years of his ministry, it is supposed he preached upwards of eight thousand sermons, baptized five thousand persons, and received into the church, by the rite of confirmation, more than two thousand. "Although almost constantly overwhelmed with labor," says one who knew him well, "never was a single call of duty neglected. He was always ready to wend his way to his distant congregations, or convey the peace of the Gospel to the abodes of disease and poverty. By day and by night, even when oppressed with the infirmities of age, or weighed down by sickness, or worn out by constant mental and physical exertion, he would forsake the comforts of home, and fly to the post of duty, preaching the Gospel, instructing the young, and administering the consolations of religion to the sick and the dying, burying the dead, and comforting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction." All his duties were discharged with the most conscientious fidelity. His great regret was, that the results of his labors were not more satisfactory. The field which he was required to cultivate was so extensive, owing to the system which at that time prevailed, and which often made it necessary for a man to take charge of as many congregations as are now connected with a single Synod, that he was not able to give to his people that amount of attention which he desired, and their interests demanded. Still he did under the circumstances, what he could, and we have seen that his labors were owned and blessed by the Great Head of the church, to the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom.

XXIV.

MICHAEL EYSTER.

More than twenty years have passed away since we first met with the subject of our present sketch, and from the very beginning of our acquaintance, we entertained for him the warmest regard, which more intimate relations only strengthened, and the changes of time never diminished. Seldom have we encountered a stranger, to whom we so quickly became attached, and felt more free in giving our most unreserved confidence. The attachment was reciprocated, the confidence was not misplaced. In connexion with the reminiscences of our college days, our relations with this dear brother are among the most pleasant, and as busy memory reverts to the scenes of the past, and recalls to mind the associations of by-gone years, we still think of him with mingled feelings of delight and sadness, and remember with satisfaction the many happy hours we took sweet counsel together, shared each other's sorrows and joys, travelled in company the road to knowledge, and unitedly bowed the knee at the mercy seat, in earnest supplication to our common Father, for his blessing. In a communication received from him only a short time before his death, referring to this period, he says: "Those were halcyon days—days, the scenes and incidents of which will ever constitute the brightest and loveliest chapters of our history—days to which we may recur, if not with unmingled delight, yet with feelings of profoundest gratitude."

The more we knew Mr. Eyster, the more we loved him. His influence over us was most salutary. During our whole intercourse with him, we never saw anything in the man unbecoming the gentleman, or unworthy the christian. Never did we hear from his lips an expression which we could now wish unsaid, nor witness in his conduct that which we could now desire undone. We always regarded him as one of nature's noblemen, as a christian of exalted integrity, who enjoyed communion with his God, and who realized the responsibilities of life. This, we know, is strong praise, and many who were brought into occasional contact with Mr. Eyster, may suppose that we have drawn too high an estimate of his character. He was not, perhaps, generally appreciated. Naturally retiring and distant, modest and unobtrusive in his manners, only those who were intimately acquainted with

him, and had full access to his heart, could form anything like a correct opinion of his excellencies, and could properly understand the noble qualities he possessed. There is a mournful interest connected with the duty we are now attempting to discharge, and as the spirit of our departed friend rests in the bosom of his God, glad shall we be if the narrative of his virtues, and the recollections of his example shall animate and quicken others to active efforts in the service of the Redeemer!

Michael Eyster was a native of York County, and was born May 16th, 1814. He died August 11th, 1853, and was consequently, at the time of his death, in the fortieth year of his age. He was of German extraction, the son of Adam and Elizabeth Eyster, and spent his early days at home on the farm, helping his father, who was engaged in agricultural pursuits. When he reached his thirteenth year, he was placed in a mercantile house in York, where he remained for several years, and, by his industrious habits and attention to business, soon won the confidence and favor of his employers. At this critical period of his life, thrown into the society of other young men, older than himself, and practiced in sin, his morals for a season greatly suffered. He wandered far from the path of rectitude, into forbidden scenes, and disregarded the pious lessons inculcated upon his youthful mind beneath the paternal roof. Distinctly do we remember, on more than one occasion, his recital of the imminent danger to which he was exposed, and his expressions of gratitude to his Heavenly Parent, for his happy deliverance. The claims of religion, it is true, had not made any decided impression upon his heart before he left home. He had never felt any special concern in reference to the salvation of the soul, yet the early training he had received, would not allow him, without some compunction, to indulge in that which he knew was sinful. Conscience, that faithful monitor, kindly implanted within our breast, often reproved him for his derelictions, and reminded him of his obligations. God did not forsake him. He was not given up to hardness of heart. The Holy Spirit continued to strive with him, and it may be, in answer to fervent, effectual prayer, which was daily poured forth at the family altar, the young man was brought, as a penitent prodigal, to the foot of the cross. He is most deeply exercised on the subject of religion; his mind is shrouded in darkness and gloom, and he is found anxiously inquiring "what he must do to be saved?" He felt, however, that no human

agency could furnish the relief he needed. So overwhelmed was he with a sense of his guilt, and his utter inability to rescue himself from impending ruin, that he turned to God as the only source of safety. On bended knees, in an upper room of the store, he pleads for the divine forgiveness, and promises, if his petitions are granted, to devote himself unreservedly to the christian ministry. He soon found the peace he so much desired. His despair and distress gave place to hope and gladness of spirit. He enjoyed the consciousness of pardoned sin through the merits of the Redeemer. He could trust in God, he could submit to his will. Jesus was precious to his soul, and he rejoiced that he was a child of God. Old things had passed away—all things had become new. He at once relinquishes his situation in the store, and commences the necessary arrangements, preparatory to the important work, to which he had solemnly dedicated himself. Renouncing pecuniary advantages, he is happy in the decision to which he has come. Although his prospects in business were exceedingly promising, and the most tempting offers were presented, to secure his permanent services, he indignantly rejected all worldly considerations. He felt that he was called to a higher vocation, to a nobler work, that he "must be about his Father's business," that he must hereafter labor for the salvation of souls in the ministry of reconciliation.

He soon commenced his Academic course of study in Marshall College, then located in York, and, at the time under the care of Rev. Dr. Rauch, to whom he always seemed much attached, and whose teachings exerted no inconsiderable influence upon his youthful pupil. On the removal of the institution to Mercersburg, Mr. Eyster repaired to Gettysburg, for the purpose of continuing the prosecution of his studies in the institutions of his own church. He became a member of Pennsylvania College in the fall of 1835, and the following year entered the Theological Seminary. During this period, he was regarded as a faithful student and a consistent christian, and by his honorable and exemplary deportment, secured the respect and confidence of all with whom he was brought into association.

His Theological studies having been completed, he was licensed to preach the Gospel in the fall of 1838, by the Synod of West Pennsylvania. Soon after, he accepted a call to Williamsburg, Pa., and congregations in the vicinity, and immediately commenced his ministerial career. During his residence at this place, he devoted himself to study with great

assiduity, and the most unremitting application, and to this fact, in connexion with the severe labor the duties of the charge required, is to be ascribed the commencement of his physical prostration, from which he subsequently suffered. In this field of usefulness he labored for upwards of seven years with great efficiency and success, and exchanged it for another, only on account of the impaired state of his health. His congregations were attached to him, and he commanded the esteem of the whole community.

In the Spring of 1846, he received and accepted a call to the Greencastle charge. Here also he had the most abundant reason to believe that his services were appreciated, and the divine blessing rested upon his efforts to do good. Many were added to the church under his ministry, and the religious character of the flock materially improved. He seemed happy in his position, and apparently settled, in the midst of a devoted people, for life. But an unforeseen and most unexpected circumstance, disappointed his calculations and frustrated all his plans. Three years of his ministry in this place had scarcely passed, when he was called to experience a most painful bereavement in the death of an affectionate and beloved wife, whom he had led to the altar in 1839, and to whom he was most tenderly attached—an engagement between them having been entered into, long before he commenced his preparations for the ministry. The love he cherished for her was of the most ardent and romantic character, his devotion was deep and most intense. "She, who had been the guiding star of his boyish days, the charm of his early manhood, the joy of the present, and the hope of the future, was borne ruthlessly away by the chill hand of death, and left him a bereaved, a changed and almost broken-hearted man. A sad and cheerless despondency overcame him. An event, which he had never even contemplated, broke upon him with crushing power, and a cloud of despair, dark and heavy, hung gloomily about his pathway, and shut out from his gaze all that was bright, all that was hopeful. His health received a shock from which it never fully recovered, and his mind an impression which caused his friends much alarm, lest the effects might be permanently disastrous. But his trust in a higher power never forsook him. He saw the hand of God in the affliction, and humbly submitted himself to the will of him who ever tempers his judgment with mercy, and supplies some balm for every wounded spirit. Although he pursued his labors with his usual devotion, and preached the

truth with a power and an effect heightened by his affliction, yet he never fully recovered from the severe calamity which had befallen him."*

The loss which he sustained, gave to his tender susceptibilities a sombre hue, a deep shade of melancholy, which was constantly apparent, and exercised an influence over his feelings. In a letter written about this time, he remarks: "I have seen a dear and tender *mother* close her eye in the dreamless sleep of death, a fond *father* and an affectionate *brother*, and above all, the dear, dear *wife* of my bosom laid in the cold, the silent grave. But it was God that did it, and acquiescence in his providences is both our duty and our privilege. I do not wish them back again. They rest from their labors, and their works have followed them." The associations connected with his residence at Greencastle, however, became so painful to him, that he gladly sought relief from his grief in a change of location. He accordingly resigned his charge, much to the regret of his people, and with his three bereaved children, removed to Greensburg, Pa., where he continued to labor also with great acceptance, until the termination of his useful life, in the summer of 1853.

Mr. Eyster's health had been, for some time, gradually declining, but his friends never abandoned all hope of his recovery. They did not, indeed, apprehend any immediate danger, until death appeared inevitable. They clung to him with great affection. They felt as if he could not yet be spared from active duty. He attended the meeting of the Pittsburg Synod, held in the month of June, 1853, but he seemed very frail. Fatal disease was apparently making progress in his system, and serious apprehensions were excited with regard to the result. He, on this occasion, preached his last sermon. His strength was scarcely adequate for the service, but his brethren were anxious to hear him once more, and he yielded to their wishes. The theme selected by him was the nature of the Eucharist, based on the words: "This do in remembrance of me," and although the sermon was extemporaneous, "it equalled," it is said, "in beauty of delivery, depth of thought, and force of argument, any of his best efforts in former days. Those who were present on that occasion, will not forget the elegant and philosophical discourse which closed the ministerial labors of their accom-

* William C. Lane, M. D., Greensburg, Pa., to whom our obligations are due.

plished brother and co-laborer. His audience listened to the sermon with deep and painful interest, for they all felt that death had marked him for the tomb, and that his place in the ministry would soon be vacant."

On his return from Synod, urged by his friends, with the view of resuscitating his health, he made a visit to the Bedford Springs, but deriving no benefit from the use of the water, he directed his course to the home of his childhood, and there returned to die in the bosom of his own family. He was confined to the house only one week before his death. Disease did its work fast. In a few days the struggle was over, and his mission on earth fulfilled. His sufferings during the brief illness, were severe, but they were endured without complaint, and with remarkable fortitude and submission to the Divine will. He spoke of the change with great composure and christian triumph. He said that "he felt he was dying, but he was not afraid of death; earth had few pleasures, but many sorrows, and he was quite willing to go to the house of eternal rest, in which he would be forever free from their invasion." With his children he conversed most affectionately, and as they drew near his couch, he tenderly embraced them, giving them the most minute instructions in reference to their future life, and earnestly beseeching them to follow the example and lessons they had received from him. He requested them to kneel around his bed, and in a clear and strong tone he poured forth his expiring breath in earnest supplication to God on their behalf. His radiant smile, his glowing love of the Redeemer, and his perfect assurance of entering into the joy of his love, will never be obliterated from the minds of those who witnessed his dying hours. The last words he uttered were addressed to one of the officers of the church, who had been his constant and devoted friend. Looking him full in the face, he softly whispered, "I expect to meet you in heaven." Then turning his eyes towards the window of his chamber, he gazed for a moment upon the rays of the setting sun, and soon his spirit passed away as peacefully as the gentle ripple dies upon the beach.

"The angel of the covenant
Was come; and faithful to his promise, stood,
Prepared to walk with him thro' death's dark vale,
And now his eyes grew bright, and brighter still—
Too bright for ours to look upon, suffused
With many tears—and closed without a cloud.
They set as sets the morning star, which goes

Not down behind the darkened west, nor hides
Obscured among the tempests of the sky,—
But melts away into the light of heaven."

On the twelfth day of August, at six o'clock in the evening, just as the sun was declining behind the western hills, and the moon was casting her pensive light upon the gathered multitude, they carried him to the grave. Beside two of his predecessors in the pastoral office, they laid him, in the Cemetery of the church, and there he will quietly rest till the morning of the resurrection, when "the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and this mortal put on immortality."

"Nor pains, nor grief, nor anxious fear,
Invade thy bounds; no mortal cares
Can reach the peaceful sleeper here,
While angels watch the soft repose!"

The neighboring brethren were present, and participated in the solemnities of the funeral services. Discourses were subsequently, by special appointment, preached in Greensburg and Adamsburg, the respective churches in which Mr. Eyster officiated at the time of his death, by Rev. Messrs. J. Martin and W. S. Emery, both of them selecting, without any previous consultation, as the text for the occasion: "For he was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, and much people was added unto the Lord."

Mr. Eyster's last illness, death and burial, were attended with such demonstrations of wide-spread and deep-felt sorrow and esteem, as only a lively sense of his great private virtues and public relations could inspire, and which are not always accorded even to one holding the highest official station, cut down in the midst of public duties, and the height of usefulness.

Although comparatively a young man, he had gained a strong hold upon the church. He was frequently invited to occupy positions of commanding influence, but the most advantageous offers were declined by him, because he felt that he was, at the time, useful in the field of labor in which he was engaged, and could see no satisfactory reason for making the change. He was also invited to situations in connexion with the literary institutions of the church, but these invitations were promptly rejected; he was unambitious, except to do good, and he believed he was called to preach the Gospel. This he regarded as his appropriate sphere, as that department of labor in which he could best serve his Master, and from this work, to which he had solemnly consecrated his

powers, no other pursuit, whether subordinate or not, could divert his attention or interest.

In attempting an analysis of Mr. Eyster's character, we naturally first turn to his piety. He was, in the full force of the words, a good man. His perfect sincerity and christian integrity, none dared call into question. He walked with God. Never have we known one more under the influence of religious principle, of faith, and of the hope of the Gospel. He was endowed by nature with many noble qualities. These had been sanctified by the power of divine truth. All that he did seemed to be marked by uprightness and purity of motive. You always knew where to find Michael Eyster. Frank, ingenuous, and sincere, there was no concealment of his sentiments. He had no two sets of opinions. He never seemed to have any sinister purposes in view. He was the most unselfish of men. No sacrifice for the relief of others, was considered by him too great. By many he was regarded as generous to a fault. His purse and his services, his sympathy and his counsels were always at the disposal of those whom he loved. Yet his benefactions were not confined to friends, or to his own brethren in the faith. He recognized in every man a brother, and cheerfully was he disposed to labor for his happiness, and the improvement of his condition. He was attached to his own communion. He cordially embraced, and greatly revered the symbol of his church, believing that its doctrines were in perfect harmony with the word of God, yet he did not prescribe the Augsburg Confession as a test of religious faith; you never discovered in him any sectarian prejudice or ignoble jealousy. He was a man of truly Catholic spirit, and liberal in his estimate of other denominations. He acknowledged all as christians whose daguerreotype resembled the divine Master, whose life corresponded with their professions.

We always admired Mr. Eyster's fearless character. He was never afraid to stand alone in a good cause. It mattered not to him, who were with him, or who were opposed to him. It was sufficient for him to know that he was right. His was a moral courage that never blenched. He would have defended the truth in opposition to the whole universe. The language of the immortal Reformer he could readily have adopted: "*Hier stehe ich ; ich kann nicht anders : Gott helfe mir ! Amen !*" When he was convinced that he was in the path of duty, no human being could have intimidated him, no influences that were brought to bear upon him, could have

tempted him to swerve from his principles. He was a bold and independent thinker. He never echoed the sentiments of others. He never took any man's mere *ipse dixit*, however prominent his position or venerable his character. He thought for himself on all questions. Although it may seem contradictory, yet he entertained a very humble opinion of his own abilities. He made no pretensions. He was modest and unassuming, and for this reason was often underrated, where he was not fully known. His opinions, however, were not hastily formed. They were the result of thoughtful deliberation and of careful investigation. He took time before he decided, and hence it was seldom necessary for him to reverse his decisions. If he found he was wrong in his views, or had committed a mistake, no one was more willing to retract and make the honorable reparation. He never clung to an opinion because he had publicly committed himself in favor of it; his pride never prevented him from acknowledging his error. He possessed a fine sense of honor. He never stooped to do a little thing. He despised meanness. No one could charge him with that which was undignified or unworthy a christian.

As a scholar, Mr. Eyster was a man of considerable attainment. Although his attention had been directed principally to Theological studies, yet he was, by no means, a novice in other departments of knowledge. He was fond of the natural sciences, and was quite familiar with history and intellectual philosophy. He had also cultivated a taste for poetry, and could, with great facility, quote from the standard authors of our language. His favorite study was, however, Theology, in the whole range of which he seemed at home. Those truths, which were difficult and abstruse to others, appeared easy and intelligible to his mind.

As a preacher, he was solid. His sermons always contained thought. They were clear and logical, and could easily be followed by the hearer. It requires long and patient mental discipline to enable a speaker to attain simplicity without the sacrifice of elegance of style, and to maintain a constant elevation of thought, without becoming unintelligible to any. Mr. Eyster had reached that point. He was disposed to discard ornament, and to present truth in the simplest and plainest language. When he used illustrations, they were always apt, and their point could at once be seen. There was a freshness, as well as an originality in his discourses, not

always met with at the present day. His manner in the pulpit was earnest and dignified. He spoke with pathos and humility. His power over the audience was very great. The impression he usually left was deep and abiding. He possessed great fluency of speech, and in his extemporaneous efforts he was exceedingly happy. It is said that few men had the ability to preach so profoundly and so readily on any text, with as little preparation as he required. His study of the sacred volume had been so careful, that he was never at a loss for truth, and his quotations from the scriptures were most felicitous. The grand theme of all his preaching was the cross. "Around the cross," says one who knew him well, "all his hopes centred, from it all his thoughts diverged, and back to it they always returned. This was the secret of his success in convincing and persuading men to renounce sin and unite themselves with the followers of the Lord."

As a minister of the Gospel, Mr. Eyster was most faithful. During the fifteen years of his ministry, the one idea which had prompted him to give himself to the work, always pervaded his mind and influenced his conduct. Never did he shrink from the performance of labor, nor become weary in well-doing. When he was in delicate health and scarcely able to preach, his friends would often urge him to omit the regular exercises of the sanctuary, but his reply was, that his personal comfort was insignificant compared with the great duty he owed the church, and the cause of the Redeemer. Whatsoever his hand found to do, he did it with his might, for he knew there was "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither" he was going.

He now rests from his labors, but his works do follow him! What a motive to animate the christian in his efforts to do good, is derived from the fact that when dead he shall yet speak! Time is short! Life is uncertain!

"The insatiate archer has an arrow for each of us,
To the same complexion we must come at last,
The like event happeneth to us all."

Our work will soon be accomplished, and our labors terminate in the grave. We are all in a current that is moving forward into the great ocean of eternity.

"While man is growing, life is in the decrease,
And cradles rock us nearer to the tomb,
Our birth is nothing but our death begun,
As tapers waste, that instant they take fire."

Let us, then, do life's work in the appropriate hour. Let us

be faithful in the performance of every duty. Let us strive to be useful and fulfil the object of our being, earnestly looking to Him who has promised to be with us at all times, even until the end, and to give us the strength required for every duty! "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs: heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ: if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us."

ARTICLE IV.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

By G. A. Lintner, D. D., Schoharie, N. Y.

It is of fundamental importance to the salvation of men, that they should understand the principles on which God has established his church, and the authority with which he has invested it, for accomplishing the ends of its institution. That the church is a divine institution, placed on a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, is an established fact, which can no longer be questioned. All past history proves it. Through all the changes and revolutions in which so many of the institutions of this world have disappeared, the church has been preserved. She has survived the rage and persecutions of her enemies and after all her conflicts and trials, she stands at this day stronger than ever, on the basis which has always sustained her.

But although the church is a divine institution, placed under the care and protection of the Almighty, she is to be preserved, and extended through the earth, by human instrumentality. The principles on which God has established his church, he will always maintain, by the exercise of his sovereign authority; but there is an authority, which he has committed to men, to teach the doctrines, and administer the ordinances of our holy religion, according to his will and purposes, revealed in his covenant with his people. This authority, with which God has invested his servants, for the instruction, government, and discipline of his church, must be well understood, and faithfully exercised by those to whom

it is committed. Without the exercise of such authority, by ministers and other officers of the church, the pure and holy principles of true religion cannot be sustained against the corruption and wickedness to which they are exposed in this world.

The church, as a visible body, is not entirely free from human corruption and depravity. Sin has invaded her borders, and shows its sad effects in the evil and disorderly conduct of many who belong to her communion. And the church cannot exist as a body, separate from the world, holy and acceptable unto God. She cannot be preserved from the degenerating influence of corruption among her own members, and the evils to which she is exposed from the world, without the wise and judicious exercise of that government which God has prescribed in his word. In the discussion of this subject, I propose, 1. *To inquire into some of the general principles of that ecclesiastical government, which christians should exercise in their spiritual connexion and fellowship with each other ;* and 2. *Consider those principles in their application to the government and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church :*

There are some who suppose, that the church should never exercise *any* authority over her members. They have an idea that christians should be left to govern themselves by the religious principles which they profess, without any restrictions of ecclesiastical authority. This theory is more specious than practical. It might be sustained, if all connected with the church were as holy and perfect in their characters and lives, as they should be. Then we should need no law to regulate the conduct of christians. They would be a law unto themselves, and the church would be a paradise on earth. But such a state of perfection cannot be attained by the church in *this* world. She has always had some in her visible connexion, who were unholy, and she will be subject to the evil influences of unworthy members, until she reaches her glorified state in heaven. Those even, who are real christians, and come nearest to perfection, are still imperfect, and need the care and government of the church, to make greater advances in piety. The idea, therefore, that christianity can exist without law ; and that we can dispense with all authority and government in the church, is fallacious. It is inconsistent with all human experience, since the church was established in the world.

The apostle Paul, in his interview with the elders of the church of *Ephesus* at *Miletus*, refers to this subject, and requires them to exercise the ecclesiastical authority which they had received from the Holy Ghost, for the sustenance and edification of the church. "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood." Those ministers, or bishops, as they are called in the original language of the New Testament, did not derive their authority from an exclusive episcopal ordination, or any official pre-eminence, conferred by the title of bishops or priests, as is sometimes contended for in our day. They received the pastoral office, and the authority connected with it, from Christ, through the Holy Spirit, and they could exercise it only so far as he had directed them. The inspired apostle also instructs the people, to obey their spiritual overseers, whom Christ had invested with authority for the government of his church. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves."—Hebrews 13: 17.

This principle of submission to Christ's authority, as exercised by his servants, who had the care and government of his church in the days of the apostle, is the *basis* upon which all ecclesiastical authority must rest in our day. Christ has never authorized any of his servants to exercise an independent power in his church. The church has no right to exercise any authority which she did not directly derive from Christ, or irrespective of the rights of conscience. Men, as spiritual rulers in the church, are to execute the laws of Christ. They are not to make their own laws, establish their own rules, and carry out their own views and principles, however necessary and just they may seem. In all matters connected with ecclesiastical government and discipline, we are to follow the direction of Christ in his word. He has given us all the directions which are necessary on this subject. True, he has not entered into particulars. He has not furnished a connected and systematic form, containing specific rules for every case which may occur; but he has laid down fundamental and general principles, covering the whole ground of ecclesiastical government, suitable to all cases, and admitting of universal application through the church.

One of these principles is, *that the church, as a spiritual body, must be kept separate and distinct from the world.* The church is the body of Christ, which he has purchased with his blood, and purified by his spirit; that it may be kept unspotted from the world. It is the spiritual family of God,

which is to be distinguished from all worldly connexions and associations, by a strict conformity to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel. This is the design of the church, and the character it should always maintain before the world. But it is to be lamented, that the church does not always sustain this high and holy character, and that among many of her members, there is such a disposition to conform to the world. Hence the apostle says: "Be ye not conformed to the world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may know what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."—*Rom. 12: 2*. He reminds christians of their high calling, and exhorts them to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them."—*Eph. 5: 11*. Speaking of the corruptions prevailing among the children of this world, and the danger of christians participating in them, he urges the disciples of Christ to "come out from among them, and be separate."—*2 Cor. 6: 17*. And Christ himself, the founder of his church, and the great teacher sent from God to instruct us in the nature and design of his spiritual government on earth, has told us, "My kingdom is not of this world."—*John 18: 36*. He said also to his disciples, "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own, but because ye are not of the world, for I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."—*John 15: 19*.

These declarations of scripture show that the kingdom of Christ in this world, is designed to be holy and heavenly in its character, and can have no fellowship with the works of darkness. They establish the principle that, the church must be kept separate from the world; and this principle must be faithfully carried out by those who administer the government of the church. They are bound to watch over the purity of the church, and endeavor to guard it against the introduction of a worldly spirit. They are to manage its affairs according to the principles and spirit of the Gospel, and not stop to consult the views and feelings of worldly-minded men, when God commands them to go forward in the path of duty, which he has marked out for them.

Men, who in their hearts are strangers to true religion, and opposed to its real interests, are always ready to exercise a controlling influence over the church. In almost every religious community, there are some such men, who would carry the spirit of the world into religion. They have an idea, that the church cannot be sustained without bringing in this

worldly influence. Let ministers and officers of churches beware of such an influence. The men who would exert it, are often of high standing in community. Their property and rank in society give them the power of creating schisms, and raising disturbances which are not easily quelled. Let christians beware how they throw themselves into the power of such men; for there is nothing that will so soon destroy a church, as such a worldly spirit and policy. God has separated his church from the world, and there can be no compromise between them; no communion between light and darkness; no fellowship between righteousness and unrighteousness. This principle God has established in his word—and on this principle the government of the church must be administered, if she is to be preserved pure and unspotted from the world. Irreligious persons should have the compassion, and sympathy, and kind feeling of the church. They are entitled to her labors and sacrifices for their spiritual good; but under no circumstances should they be allowed to exert a controlling influence in her councils, or interfere with her government and discipline.

Another principle which Christ has established in the scriptures for the government of his church is, *that her unity and harmony must be preserved, by excluding from her communion, disorderly and unworthy members.* A house divided against itself cannot stand. An association which is not bound together by congenial principles and harmonious action, must soon be broken up. So the church, which is an association, formed and established on the principles of the Gospel, must be united in those principles, or she cannot stand. Her unity is essential for her success and efficiency in the great work to which her energies are to be directed. Hence she is commanded by divine authority to withdraw herself from every brother that walks disorderly; to separate from her communion, such as propagate error, break their covenant engagements, create dissensions, or in any other way bring dishonor on the christian profession. The apostle speaks of the church as *one* body in Christ, and members one of another. He exhorts them to “keep the *unity* of the spirit in the bonds of peace.”—*Eph.* 4: 3; to “walk by the same rule and mind the same thing.”—*Phill.* 3: 16; and that this holy fellowship, which binds them together, may be preserved uncorrupted and unimpaired, he directs, “If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to the doctrine of Christ, from such *withdraw* thyself.”—*1 Tim.* 6: 3. “Mark them which

cause divisions, and *avoid* them."—*Rom.* 16: 17. "I have written to you not to keep company with any man that is a brother, if he be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner—put away from yourselves that wicked person."—*1 Cor.* 11: 13.

These apostolic directions were given, to prevent the body of Christ from being rent asunder by unholy and refractory members. For this purpose Christ gave to his ministers the keys of the kingdom of heaven, of which he speaks in *Matt.* 16: 19. They give authority to ecclesiastical rulers, and all religious bodies, to exclude from their communion, persons whose disorderly and wicked conduct have rendered them unworthy of christian fellowship. This was the original design of the "power of the keys." In this sense it was exercised by the first christians, and is still retained in the church. Every church must determine for itself, when it is necessary to exercise such an authority; and when it does become necessary, christians should proceed to acts of discipline with caution, moderation, and in the spirit of their Master. They should treat offenders with forbearance and charity. But when the honor and interests of religion are assailed, when they are suffering from the defection and wickedness of those who profess to be the friends of the Redeemer, and stand identified with his cause, the church has a duty to perform. She must wipe from her skirts the shame and reproach that have been brought upon her. She must wash her hands of the sin of tolerating such iniquity. She must make an example for her own members, and before the world. And to shrink from her duty in such cases, or show any hesitation or fear, would be to prove faithless to the trust which her supreme Head has reposed in her. It would make her a participator in the sin lying at her door, and expose her to the judgments of the Almighty. When men are suffered to transgress the rules of christian discipline, and trample on the order and authority of the church to which they belong, they become hardened in sin. One such disorderly member may spread his evil influence through a whole religious community. The whole camp of Israel was troubled by one such sinner. The judgments of God fell upon the entire congregation, for tolerating such an abuse, neither could that judgment be removed, until the sin of *Achan* had been visited, and a public example made before the people.

There can be nothing more offensive in the sight of God, than the professed disciples of Christ wounding him in the

house of his friends, and harboring and upholding his enemies, by the neglect of christian discipline. The church must not suffer such a reproach to rest upon her. She must deal faithfully and promptly with every offender. Whatever may be his standing and influence, he must be brought to account, and if guilty, not screened from punishment. He may be professedly a moral man, and even assume the garb of holiness, in his endeavors to sow the seeds of disaffection and disunion in the church; this is no reason why he should be indulged in his wicked work. A factious and unruly spirit is often concealed under a sanctimonious covering, and it is sometimes difficult to tear away the veil, and expose the guilty offender. But it must be done; for such professed friends are more dangerous, and do more evil to ministers and churches, than the open enemies of religion. No church can exist in order, it cannot be kept in harmony, and live in peace, where such factious and troublesome spirits are at work. Disunion, corruption, and eventual dissolution, either in the church, or between the minister and his charge, must be the consequence. The church has the power of protecting herself against errorists, schismatics, and disturbers of her peace, and unless she faithfully exercises this power, which God has committed to her for her own preservation, she cannot expect to be sustained by his divine approbation and blessing.

There is another important principle laid down in the scriptures, which the church should always keep in view in the exercise of the spiritual authority committed to her, and that is, *she must maintain the pure doctrine of the Gospel, and suffer no departure from those great fundamental truths which the scriptures reveal as essential to salvation.* One great design, and it may be said, perhaps, the chief purpose for which Christ established his church and ministry on earth, was, that he might make known to them the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and give them authority to teach and maintain the truth. He has revealed the truth to his people in various ways, through successive generations, and made it their sacred duty to preserve it pure and uncorrupted. This duty was enjoined by our Savior on his apostles, when he commissioned them to go forth and teach all nations, to "observe all things, whatsoever he had commanded them."—*Matt. 28: 20.* The same duty is urged by the apostles on the ministers and churches who succeeded them in the work of preaching the Gospel through the world. "Hold fast the

form of sound words which thou hast heard."—2 *Tim.* 1: 13. "Take heed unto thyself, and thy doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this, thou shalt save both thyself, and them that hear thee."—1 *Tim.* 4: 16. "It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints."—*Jude* 3. "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel."—*Phill.* 1: 27. "If any man preach any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed."—*Gal.* 1: 9.

Such is the language of the apostle in regard to the christian duty of steadfastness in the truth.* And christians would do well to give earnest heed to these apostolic injunctions; especially in this day, when the interests of truth, and sound doctrine, are so easily sacrificed to what is termed the *progressive spirit* of the age. This spirit is making wonderful progress. It is unsettling the fundamental doctrines, the pillars of the church, breaking down the ramparts of truth, demolishing the fences round the enclosure of the fold of Christ, and letting in the enemy like a flood. It is a spirit professing to have a very tender regard for the rights of conscience and freedom of opinion, and under this specious pretence it would drive out of the church all doctrinal standards

* There are too many in the church, who are continually crying peace, and seem willing to make any sacrifice to retain it. Peace certainly is desirable, but the church should never think of purchasing it at the expense of truth. The duty of christians is, first, to hold fast the truth, and seek peace afterwards. In the christian warfare there are always some who are tempted by their fears to remain neutral, to halt between two opinions, scarcely knowing which side to join; or trying to reconcile differences, by surrendering their principles and convictions of duty. And this kind of neutrality, or rather compromising spirit, is by many considered an amiable and praiseworthy trait in the christian character, while those who stand up in defence of the truth, unwilling to surrender it, are branded as ultraists and bigots, devoid of all christian charity. It has almost become a reproach in our day, for a man to be so orthodox, or symbolical, as to be unwilling to change his views with every new improvement in religion or theology. If these new discoveries and improvements go on at the rate they have for some time past, it will not be long before the commands and exhortations of scripture, requiring christians to remain steadfast and immovable, contending earnestly for the faith, will be out of date; the Bible become a dead letter; the church may dispense with all government and discipline, and let every man exercise his liberty of believing and doing what may seem right in his own eyes. We shall then have a practical demonstration of the beauties of the new system; and whoever will be unwilling to acknowledge its superiority to all the systems that have preceded it, must expect to be denounced as a bigoted opposer of the light, and an enemy to liberty.

and forms of government, which are indispensable for the preservation of the truth. Men who are opposed to the truth, are impatient of restraint. They wish to cast off the order and government with which Christ has invested his church; and *this* is the reason why they are so ready to fall in with the spirit of opposition to all ecclesiastical authority, and join in the clamor against confessions and creeds, which has of late become so popular.

When such a spirit prevails, christians cannot be too often reminded of the established principles of church government and discipline, which the scriptures teach. The church is the pillar and ground of truth. She has a sacred trust committed to her, not only for herself, but for those who come after her. And she is bound to deliver to future generations, as well as hold fast for herself, this sacred deposit of truth, pure and undefiled as she has received it from her divine Head. If the truth revealed in the scriptures is essential to salvation—if all men are to believe and practice it, it is right that the church should seek to preserve it in her standards, and forms of government. No one who has correct and enlightened views on this subject, will consider such an authority, when it is exercised within the limits which the scriptures prescribe, any *infringement* on christian liberty; but rather regard it as a means of preventing that liberty from being *abused*. Take away this authority from the church, remove her confessions of faith, and her forms of government, and what security have we that we shall not be launched on the broad sea of error, to be driven about by every wind of doctrine, without a compass or a chart? Who would abandon the order and government which Christ has established in his church, and leap into the dark gulf of human expedients,

* Many of the Lutheran churches of Germany have been overrun with rationalism and infidelity; but not till after their ministers, under the influence of modern notions of liberty, began to dispense with the confessions and formularies introduced by the Reformation. It was this departure from the symbols of the Reformation, together with laxity of christian discipline, that opened the door for the flood of error and corruption, which subsequently spread through the churches. Hence, when the friends of evangelical religion made an effort to bring the churches back from their apostacy, and re-establish them in the principles of the Reformation, they found it necessary to return to the old standards. This was done at a late ecclesiastical convention (Kirchen-Tag) in which most of the German protestant churches were represented. The Augsburg Confession was reaffirmed, and adopted as the symbol of the Reformation, embracing the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, in which all evangelical christians can unite.

where so many souls have been lost? What christian who loves God, and regards the honor of religion, would venture on such an experiment? Let the ministers and officers of the church, who are to instruct and govern it according to established principles, which they have solemnly promised to observe, beware how they are led away by the temptations of the times from those principles. Let them stand by the church, in the exercise of her legitimate authority for the maintenance of the truth, and God will bless them in their labors for the instruction and edification of the people.

Such are the purposes for which Christ instituted his church, and the principles he has established for her government. He has provided that his *spiritual kingdom shall be kept separate from the world*; that the *unity and harmony of his church should be preserved, by excluding unworthy members*, and that her authority should be exercised for the *maintenance of the pure doctrines of the Gospel, which are essential to salvation*. Let us now proceed to apply these general principles, laid down in the scriptures, for the observance of all ecclesiastical authorities, to the government and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The Lutheran church in this country, is organized upon the fundamental principle, that the church can exercise no authority but that which is derived expressly from Jesus Christ, her supreme Head. Her ministers and officers are bound by the constitution, to carry out this principle, in all their ecclesiastical relations and proceedings. They have the power to rebuke, censure, and exclude from christian fellowship, such as act disorderly, or refuse to submit to the government which Christ has instituted in the church; but in the exercise of this authority, they are to be careful not to exceed the limits to which Christ has restricted us in his word.

Our system of church government is wisely adapted to promote the unity, peace, and edification of the spiritual body of Christ; and if all our ministers and members had faithfully adhered to this system, we would not now have to deplore the divisions and disorders, which in some portions of our Zion, have had such an unhappy influence.* Such evils,

*In the year 1837, a number of ministers and members belonging to our churches in the State of New York, became disaffected, withdrew from the Hartwick Synod, and formed themselves into a separate body. They renounced the Augsburg Confession, published a new Declaration of Faith, and organized under a constitution, requiring *new tests* of admission into their association, and abolishing *old established* rules of

however, will arise under the best regulated systems. Our ministers are all equal in rank and authority, and there is no cause for jealousy or strife. Our lay members are admitted to our ecclesiastical councils; and in all matters relating to the general interests of the church, they are entitled to participate in our deliberations. Their rights are secured to them in the *church councils*, the *district synods*, and the *general synod*; all so constituted, that the people, though their representatives, can exercise with the ministers, that wholesome authority and influence, which are desirable to secure the order, the harmonious action, and full coöperation of the whole church.

The *Church Council*, consisting of the minister and officers of a particular church, are entrusted with the care and government of the congregation under their immediate supervision. They admit to the communion, all such persons as they may deem qualified for a public profession of religion. They also have the power of excluding those whose conduct is inconsistent with the christian profession. It is their duty, first, to labor in the spirit of christian kindness with offenders, to rebuke and admonish them, as circumstances may require; and when they find these measures ineffectual, to suspend, or finally cut them off from the church. This arhority, however, they are to exercise under the supervision of the District Synod to which they are attached, and which, in cases of appeal, has the right to review and pass judgment, or give advice on acts of discipline performed by church councils.*

church government, under which they had been ordained and received into the church. This secession produced a division in the churches, which led to controversies between ministers, congregations, and members of churches, that had to be settled by the courts, after a long course of litigation. The churches where these difficulties occurred, have not yet recovered from their disastrous effects. Though much of the bitter feeling, which once existed, has passed away, we can still trace the unhappy influence of this division in the feeble and crippled state of the churches it has torn asunder.

* "The church council consists of the pastor, elders and deacons of a particular church. It shall be the duty of the council to administer the discipline of the church. To this end, they shall have power to cite any of their church members to appear before them, and to endeavor to obtain other witnesses, when the case may require it. It shall be their duty, when any member offends, first privately to admonish him, or, if necessary, to call him to an account; and when they shall deem these measures ineffectual, to suspend or excommunicate him. It shall also be their duty to restore those subjects of suspension, or excommunication, to all the privileges of the church, who shall manifest sincere repentance."—*Form. Gov. and Dis. Ec. Luth. Church, Chap. 4.*

The *District Synods*, composed of ordained ministers, licensed candidates, and lay representatives from the churches within their bounds, are authorized to transact all business relating to the general interests of the churches in their district, reserving to the ministers the exclusive right of examining, licensing, ordaining, and receiving into their connexion ministers, according to the provisions of the constitution. In all synodical business, the lay representatives, who come as delegates from churches, are entitled to the same rights and privileges with the clerical members. They are to consult together on the interests of the churches whom they represent, and execute such measures as they may deem necessary to promote their prosperity. Ministers are amenable for their conduct, to the Synods with whom they stand connected, and members of churches have the right of appealing to these ecclesiastical bodies* for redress of any grievances which they may suffer from the action of church councils. The District Synods are charged with the duty of preserving purity of doctrine, and an evangelical ministry in the churches under their care. They are to watch over the conduct of their members, and see that the rules of government and discipline prescribed in the Formula, are duly observed by all the ministers and congregations within their limits.†

The *General Synod* consists of clerical and lay representatives from the District Synods which are connected with it.‡

*“Any member being dissatisfied with the decision of the church council, relative to himself, may appeal to the Synod. In every such case, the applicant shall give notice to the church council of his intention, and shall specify to them the reasons of his dissatisfaction, and the grounds of his appeal.—*Chap. 5.* In cases of appeal, the council shall take no further measures grounded on their decision, until the sentence has been reviewed by the Synod, and send a detailed and correct account of their proceedings in the case.”—*Chap. 4.*

†“It shall be the duty of each Synod to see that the rules of government and discipline, prescribed in this formula, are observed by all the congregations and ministers within its bounds; to receive appeals from decisions of church councils, and special conferences, when properly brought before them, and review, reverse, or confirm said decisions; to examine and decide on all charges against ministers and licentiates, that of heterodoxy alone excepted (which belongs to the Ministerium); to form and change ministerial districts, and attend to any other business relative to their churches, regularly brought before them.”—*Chap. 8.*

‡“The General Synod consists of deputies from the several Synods, who have joined themselves thereunto, and have been duly acknowledged as members. All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods, holding the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, as taught in our church, may at any

This body acts as a general convention representing all the district Synods and churches, constituting a bond of union, for promoting the interests and prosperity of the whole church. It reviews the proceedings of the district Synods, and gives direction and advice in all cases of appeal from district Synods, ministers, or churches. It exercises a general supervision over all the churches that are represented in it, for preserving sound doctrine, and uniform order and discipline among them. The principal duty of the General Synod is, to endeavor by advisory and conciliatory measures, to heal divisions, correct abuses, aid the cause of evangelical religion, and maintain the doctrines and worship of the church, according to the word of God and our ecclesiastical usages and standards.

Such is our ecclesiastical system. It is a well-ordered, compact system; consistent in all its parts, and efficient in its operation, if faithfully carried out. But as in all systems of government, efficiency and success depend much on the manner in which they are executed, so also the utility of this system can only be tested by practical application.

Without disparaging other forms of ecclesiastical government, we conscientiously believe that this system, when judiciously and faithfully administered, is adapted most effectually to carry out the ends and purposes of Christ's kingdom on earth. We hold, that it is *scriptural*; and on this ground, we claim for it the respect and observance of all our Synods and churches. It is a system fully recognizing that principle, which is regarded as fundamental in the church of Christ, that it must be kept *separate and distinct from the world*. "The true church of Christ is a spiritual body, consisting of members whose qualifications are spiritual, and who are associated for spiritual purposes." Such is the language of our Formula. It lays down a principle, which cannot be too deeply impressed on the minds of all, whose duty it is to administer

time become associated with it, by adopting the constitution, and sending delegates according to the ratio prescribed.

"The General Synod may give their opinion and advice, when complaints shall be brought before them by Synods, Ministeriums, Congregations or individual ministers, concerning doctrine or discipline.

"The General Synod shall apply all their powers, their prayers, and means, towards the prevention of schisms, carefully regard all the circumstances of the times, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, may not pass by neglected and unavailing."—*Constitution Gen. Synod, Art. 2—3.*

the government and discipline of the church. We need an able and educated ministry. We want men of good understanding and sound judgment, for church officers. Such qualifications are indispensable; and no minister or church officer can expect to become permanently and extensively useful without them. But more than all this; we need *spiritual* men to rule and govern the church, from the lowest to the highest judicatory; men who are sound in the faith; deeply imbued with the spirit of piety; holy men, tried men, men of established religious characters, to be placed at the helm of government, and give a spiritual tone and character to our churches. Wealth is desirable in all churches, as a means of doing good. Money is needed in every congregation, to aid in its operations; but let them not be brought in to *rule* the church. When money rules the church, the Spirit of God can no longer dwell in it. He will be driven out, and the world come in and take possession. And whatever may be the standing of that church with the world—however numerous and respectable her membership, she is shorn of her strength, she is doomed to languish and die, because her *vitality* is gone. The life and power of religion, by which alone she can be sustained, are lost; she has sold herself to the enemy, to accomplish her own degradation and ruin.

Churches sometimes seek to gain influence by admitting worldly and irreligious men into their councils. They try to make friends of the enemies of true religion, by courting their favor, and flattering their prejudices. It is even sometimes thought good policy to bring back wanderers and backsliders, by making them officers. We all know that such shameful abuses have been practiced. Such a course is not only dishonoring to religion, but it is the worst policy a church can pursue. It is folly to think of building up the cause of Christ, by a compromise with its enemies and the world. God will not bless a church which has forsaken the standard of Christ, and gone over to his enemies. It is only when the church is in her right position, when she stands on the ground of true, uncompromising spirituality, separate and distinct from the world, that God will own and bless her. He will then set his seal on the church, and mark it with his glorious presence and blessing; and whether its members be few or many, rich or poor, they will exert an influence which even the enemies of religion, with all their opposition and hatred, cannot withstand.

Another principle which Christ has established in his word, and which must be faithfully applied in the government and discipline of our church, is, that her *unity and harmony be preserved, by excluding unworthy and disorderly members.*

Our form of government is as favorable to christian liberty as any one who regards the true interests of religion could desire. It makes every allowance for human imperfections, and differences of opinion among christian brethren, which do not affect fundamental points; but on the great doctrines of our religion, which are essential to salvation, it requires unity of sentiment and action among the ministers and members of our churches; without which they cannot live in harmony together. It makes it the duty of church councils and Synods, to exercise discipline against all who are guilty of fundamental errors, or disturb the peace of the church by disorderly conduct; and no church can prosper without the exercise of such discipline, when circumstances render it necessary. When persons have offended, and are willing to acknowledge their fault, and return to their duty in the church, they should be treated kindly and tenderly; but incorrigible offenders, who set themselves up against the authority and rules of christian discipline, must be cut off, lest they corrupt the whole church.

And if it be the duty of the church to exclude unworthy members, we ought to be very careful how we admit persons of doubtful character. Synods and church councils are often too easily prevailed upon to receive into their connexion, applicants who are not sufficiently indoctrinated and established in the truth. They are usually admitted without much scrutiny, without that thorough examination, which is necessary to guard the church against the errors and abuses so prevalent in our day. In our ministerial sessions, we usually attend to the examination of candidates near the close, when we are anxious to expedite business, and pass over, in a hurried manner, this, and other subjects, which are most important, and require the greatest deliberation. How can we expect to preserve the order and purity of the church against the corruptions and desecration of the times, unless we are more careful? If we suffer our churches to be overrun with opinions and practices, borrowed from other denominations, unadapted to our condition, and at variance with our constitution and standards, we cannot expect to remain long a united and harmonious body. Such innovations cannot be intro-

duced without producing divisions and contentions in the church.

It is not uncommon, under the practice lately introduced in some of our churches, for persons who profess to have received some religious impressions, to be confirmed without going to the communion; or to be called out from a promiscuous assembly, to make a public profession of religion, without previous instruction or examination. The church gains nothing by such hasty and indiscreet admissions, but lays herself open to difficulties and troubles which ought to be avoided. It seems to the writer, that we are cutting loose from the moorings which have held our ecclesiastical ship safe and sound for many years, and that we are fast driving on the rocks and quicksands, where our vessel is in danger of being stranded. The good old practice of preparing candidates for confirmation, by a regular course of preparatory instruction, was one of the best safeguards of the church, against the defection of unworthy members; and if we would avoid the frequent recurrence of this evil, we must return to this practice, which should never have been suffered to go into disuse.* If we would preserve the church from the bad influences exerted by disaffected and disorderly members, we must go back to the old established order to which ministers and members religiously adhered. It was a part of their religion to love the church; and that feeling of love and veneration for the church and her institutions, which was once

*In our church, it is considered the official duty of every minister to give *catechetical instruction* to the youth of his congregation, with a view of preparing them for the communion of the church: and this duty we consider so necessary and indispensable, that it should never be neglected where it can be performed. We are aware that some denominations of christians differ from us in their views on this subject. We know that there are pious and well disposed people, who have adopted a course in the religious education of youth, different from that which we pursue in our church. We know too, that there are some, who consider it the minister's duty to receive converts into the church, without previous instruction. If they have only experienced what *they* call religion, if their minds have been excited by strong emotions and feelings, no matter how ignorant and inexperienced in the *first principles* of christianity, they consider themselves entitled to church membership. They claim the right of being admitted; and this claim is often sanctioned by ministers, who are too ready to abandon old established principles of order in the church, and fall upon new experiments, which are attended with danger and difficulty. Instances may occur, especially in seasons of revival, when it is proper to receive converts into the church, who have not had much previous instruction. Ministers must exercise their judgment and discretion in this matter; but they should never dispense with catechetical instruction, when it can be given.—*Luth. Mag.*, 1830.

manifested, and is now in a great measure lost, must be restored; that deep-toned religious sentiment, which binds to our origin, our history, our ecclesiastical standards, the faith and customs of our fathers, must be revived. The love of order, and reverence for religious ordinances and church regulations, which Lutherans once cherished, must again be awakened in our hearts, if we would be preserved from the evils and disorders which threaten our Zion.

The last general principle we shall notice in the application of this subject, is, that the government of the church must be faithfully administered, to *defend and maintain the true doctrines of the Gospel against the inroads and assaults of their enemies.*

We ought to be thankful that our lot is cast in a church which is founded on the truth. Our fathers laid this foundation deep and solid, in that revered system of doctrine which is contained in our standards; and we owe it to the truth, to adhere to that system, and resist every attempt to change, misrepresent, or bring it into disrepute.* Let us not coun-

* A pamphlet has lately appeared among us, entitled, "*Definite Platform, doctrinal and disciplinarian, for Lutheran District Synods*," purporting to give the views of a number of our ministers, who "desire a more specific expression of the General Synod's doctrinal basis." It has been circulated through the church, with a view to its adoption by the churches coconnected with the General Synod, instead of the present basis of that body. It is indeed strange, that an overture on a subject of so much importance as *changing our doctrinal basis*, and introducing a *new standard* into the church, should come to us without any names, or ecclesiastical authority, to recommend it. When changes are proposed "doctrinal and disciplinarian," affecting the interests of the whole church, they are generally recommended by synods or conventions, who are duly authorized so to do; but here is a project, got up by a few individuals in secret conclave, and then thrown out upon the church like a torpedo, to make an explosion, without any one being willing to assume the responsibility. Perhaps it was deemed the wisest course by those who were engaged in the plot; but it looked suspicious on the very face of the platform. It showed that its projectors lacked confidence in the undertaking, and it was regarded by many, perhaps most of the readers of the pamphlet, as *prima facie* evidence that there was something wrong in it. This platform professes to be a review of the Augsburg Confession, to adapt it to the circumstances of the times, and make it more acceptable to the churches; but it looks more like a labored attempt to stigmatize it, and make it odious. It does not treat the subject fairly. It takes isolated passages, separates them from their connexion, and puts constructions on them, which are not warranted by the general sense; and by this *dissecting and mutilating process*, it presents us with a *caricature* to bring that honored and sacred instrument, which has been so long regarded with veneration, into disrepute and contempt. The attempt, however, if such has been the design, has failed, and may

tenance that loose theology which, under the false notion of modern improvements, would *discard* our scriptural and orthodox confession of faith. Let us not suffer the rage for new things to deprive us of all that we deem precious and sacred in the doctrines and institutions of our evangelical church. In all our councils and deliberations for the prosperity of our Zion, let us labor that she may become more firmly established in the truth. Let not her interests be sacrificed or brought in jeopardy, for the sake of gratifying a morbid taste for the novelties of the age. Let us not try to build up her walls with untempered mortar, or burn incense unto the Lord in his holy temple, with unhallowed fire. Let all the ministers and members of our churches, with one accord, seek to carry out the principles which Christ has established and recommended for the government of his church. Let them watch over the interests of the churches committed to their care, and never think of promoting their prosperity by compromising any of those principles which are essential to true spiritual religion. We profess to be protestants, and to adhere to the principles of the Reformation, not with a bigoted and servile submission to human authority. We have not blindly adopted the faith of Luther, or that of any other man. We hold that it is the duty and privilege of all men, to exercise their judgment in matters of religion. We claim this right for ourselves, and are willing that it should be exercised by others; but as protestants, we feel bound to maintain and defend those evangelical doctrines and principles, which the Reformers so nobly asserted and vindicated in our confession of faith. Let us remain true to that confession, and not abandon it for new expedients.*

teach a useful lesson to others, who in future might be disposed to engage in similar attempts to break down the hedges which the wisdom and piety of our fathers have placed round our evangelical Zion.

* Ministers sometimes involve themselves in difficulties, by attempting to introduce new expedients, in the place of established standards, which have been long used and approved in the church. To illustrate this, I will relate the following incident, which occurred not long since, in one of our churches: An honest, conscientious old elder, well instructed in the doctrines of the Lutheran church, and cherishing a high regard for the Augsburg Confession, was one day told by his minister, that he was going to introduce a *new Platform*, which would do away the necessity of adhering any longer to the Augsburg Confession? The elder asked him to explain the new platform, and show wherein it was so much better than their old confession of faith, which it was to supersede. "I cannot now enter into the subject as fully as I wish," said the minister; "but if you will come to my house on the day before our next commu-

Let us *study* it more closely, that we may become better acquainted with it, and feel more deeply the duty of preserving inviolate the great cardinal doctrines which it teaches.

I do not say that our standards and forms are perfect, but I do maintain that they are scriptural and evangelical. No other standards are more so. None comprise more of the doctrines and principles of the Bible, as taught and exemplified in the Reformation. None are better adapted to promote the order and edification of the church of Christ. I venerate the doctrines of our standards, because they are prominent and essential features in that faith which was once delivered to the saints. I love them, because they reveal to us the way of life; they show us the love and sacrifice of Christ; the preciousness of the believer's portion, and the foundation of his hope. I consider them identified with the interests, and necessary for the prosperity of every branch of the Redeemer's kingdom, and especially of our own. Then let us see to it, that these doctrines be preserved among us in their purity; and that our form of government and discipline be administered in conformity to them, and the princi-

nion, I think I shall be able to convince you that we need something different from the Augsburg Confession, and that the proposed change will remove the difficulties under which we have hitherto labored."

On the day appointed, the elder repaired to the house of his minister, who labored hard to persuade him that the Augsburg Confession was an old relic, that had grown out of date, and that in this enlightened age, and advanced state of theological science, we needed something more adapted to the spirit of the times, to keep pace with the improvements that were going on all around us. The elder listened attentively to all this, and then asked, "what *is* this new platform you are speaking of, and how will it *work* in our congregation?" "O," replied the minister, "it points out all the errors of the Augsburg Confession, and it will have a good effect in relieving us from the imputation of holding to those errors. Besides, it will show us what parts of the confession we reject, and what we believe." "I consider the Augsburg Confession," said the elder, "correct in all fundamental points of doctrine. I always regarded it as *scriptural* and *evangelical*. Under this impression I was received into the church. I believe so still. Such is the belief of the body of our church. You were called to be our pastor with this belief, and if you are going to introduce a new platform, and throw away the Augsburg Confession, I must frankly tell you, though it grieves me to say so, that you had better throw up your call, and leave us." "I did not know," said the minister, "that you were such a strong old Lutheran. I am sorry now, that I said anything to you about the matter. But let us leave it where it is, and prepare to go to the communion to-morrow without having our minds disturbed by it; for on the day of Judgment, it will not be asked of us whether we have stood on the *old* or *new* platform."

ples which Christ has established and recommended to us in his word.

The ministers and members of the Lutheran church, at this particular crisis, have a high trust committed to their hands, and they labor under weighty responsibilities. From the divisions and dissensions which have distracted other denominations, the changes and revolutions which they have undergone, we have been mercifully preserved, until recently, when we have been threatened with similar indications. Attempts are making to introduce changes among us, which strike at the *foundation* of the present order and institutions of the church. We are in a transition state. What the issue of this state of things may be, is known only to him who, in his wise providence can overrule all things for the glory of his name, and the interests and prosperity of his church. If our beloved church is to be agitated by fierce contentions, if she is to be split into hostile parties, if she is to be stopped in her prosperous career, and all the fond hopes with which so many of her friends regard her future prospects, are to be blasted; a dreadful responsibility must rest somewhere. It cannot rest on those who stand on the old orthodox platform. They have not been the aggressors, however severely they may have been censured. They have provoked no controversies. They have introduced no new platforms. They have held no secret consultations, to change our doctrinal basis, and undermine our whole ecclesiastical system. With the charges of ultra Lutheranism, Puseyism, and Romish errors and superstitions constantly ringing in their ears, they have acted only on the *defensive*. They have steadily adhered to their principles, and honestly and faithfully discharged their duty—a duty which they owe to themselves and the church—they love and venerate. They hold a position, for which posterity will honor them. When the agitation and excitement of the day shall have passed away, their fidelity to the truth will be remembered, and gratefully acknowledged by those who shall share in the results of their present labors.

Let the friends of our Zion ask God for wisdom and grace to direct in this important crisis. Let us "buy the truth and sell it not." Let us hold fast the form of sound words, delivered unto us in the sacred scriptures, and the venerable standards, which the founders of our church transmitted to us, as a *sacred legacy* for those who shall come after us. When we are called to stand in the holy places of the sanctuary, or fill the responsible offices of professors and teachers

in our Seminaries for the education of ministers, or occupy seats in our ecclesiastical councils, to exercise the government and discipline of God's house, let us do it in the fear of God, and with a conscientious regard to the great interests of truth and righteousness. Let us remember that the Great Master Builder of his spiritual temple, has prescribed to us our work, given us his orders, laid down the rules, and furnished us with the materials for carrying on his work. Let us follow his directions, and never substitute our own wisdom for the wisdom and truth of God. Let us labor diligently, that the kingdom of God may be more fully established in our own hearts, that it may be built up in our churches, and throughout the world; and when our day of labor shall have ended, we shall be admitted to the full fruition of the joys of the church in heaven, where all our troubles and cares shall be swallowed up in praise.

ARTICLE V.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By John Lothrop Motley. In three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, 329 & 331, Pearl Street.—1856.

THE revolution, of which the development and progress, down to the death of its great leader, are related in these three large volumes, must ever possess a peculiar interest for us Americans. Of the three revolutions belonging to modern history, which, forced upon a freedom-loving people by a foreign oppressor, led to a satisfactory result in the actual establishment of a republic, it is the second: that of the Swiss Confederacy being the first, and our own the last. All others that we know of, either differ essentially from these in their principles and character, or ended in failure, terminating either in the establishment of monarchy, or in the perpetuation of a smothered anarchy, which ever and anon finds vent in convulsive throes and fearful spasms. Whatever may have been the political condition of the United Netherlands in more recent times, the revolution of which the narrative is here before us, was one of those great efforts of an intelligent, an enterprising and high-spirited people to shake off a foreign yoke, the motives and processes of which deserve our

careful study: one of those brilliant successes, the stirring scenes and incidents of which must ever have a deep interest and resistless charm for those who believe in the rights of the human being, and of civil society, as distinct from the claims of privileged classes, and independent of the despotic will of crowned rulers.

The only really important and interesting monographs which have hitherto served to make us familiar with the successful revolt of the United Netherlands from the crown of Spain, are Schiller's brilliant work, in German, and in English, Watson's carefully and copiously narrated *Life of Philip II.* But the work of the calmly deliberate and acutely observant Watson, and the gorgeous narrative of Schiller, in which philosophic speculation and poetic coloring add dignity to the historic details, breadth and animation to the delineations, splendor to the diction, and dramatic effect to the spirited tableaux and dioramic succession of imposing scenes, and startling transactions; neither is free from defects and mistakes, both leave a good deal to be desired by the curious and reflecting student of history. Between the revolution which made the Netherlands independent of the Spanish crown, and our own, there are, while in many respects they essentially differ from each other, yet very strong points of resemblance. Among the most prominent of the latter is this, that, under Providence, both revolutions revolved and unfolded themselves respectively around one great personage, as the centre of union, counsel and action; and that each, having in one such great individual its very life and soul, under his guidance worked itself out to its grand results. And these two illustrious leaders—how like each other in ardent patriotism and some other respects, how widely different in other particulars, especially in the later scenes of their career. But we cannot here follow up these resemblances and contrasts, which would furnish the rhetorician ample scope and abundant materials for comparison and antithesis. But to trace and unfold all these points of agreement and divergence, would be both interesting and instructive, and may claim our attention on some future occasion.

If, as Shakspeare says, "The world's a stage, and all the men and women only players," then are revolutions those brilliant and salient acts in the great world-drama, which, with their quick evolution of stirring scenes and the rapid succession upon the stage, of men strong in thought and word and action, will ever be the favorite themes of those

historians who delight in the accurate portraiture and nice discrimination of characters; in the skilful unfolding and minute exhibition of incidents, of events and deeds far-reaching and deep-searching in their influence and operation; in pursuing the tortuous course of latent causes to their final, often startling effects; in dramatically grouping personages and philosophically classifying actions and results, and working up the whole, with the outlining, filling up, and coloring of a master hand, into one great picture, in which all the various and discordant elements blend and harmonize in producing a grand whole, of which the several parts, however antagonistic, stand in necessary and complementary relations to each other. And such is the work which our distinguished countryman has here undertaken and produced.

This history of the "Rise of the Dutch Republic" has some strong claims to be considered the greatest historical work yet produced in our country. While it displays neither the impetuous but generous partizanship of Bancroft, nor the frigid, almost indifferent impartiality of Hildreth, it judges persons and weighs actions with the utmost candor, and though frank in the expression of opinions and sympathies, metes out equal justice to men, to parties, and their doings. The style is not as elegant and mellifluous as Irving's, or as correct and splendid as Prescott's: it is occasionally inaccurate, and sometimes exhibits asperities and irregularities, which, however, are readily forgiven in consideration of its excellencies; for it is perspicuous, manly, nervous: like a broad, majestic stream, it carries the reader along, on a rapid but steady current, through the most brilliant scenery, and anon, amidst the most sombre surroundings, often appalling in their dismal shadows. Apart from any minutiae of style, as a historical work, it is, whether viewed as a whole or in its details, deserving of the highest praise. Mr. Motley has here shown, that he possesses some of the highest qualities of a first-rate historian: an eye to take in, with comprehensive view, the great historic field stretched out before it, with the great masses of its antagonistic elements heaving in Titanic conflict, that involves the fate of nations—of great masses of human beings; but capable, at the same time, of minute analysis; of dissecting those great masses, and pointing out distinctly the separate constituents, whether of political, civil and social relations, or of private or general human interests, secular or eternal, which go to make them up: an

acute discrimination as respects the relations of these several elements to each other, and collectively to their combined, or separately to their respective effects: a deep interest in the men and scenes which he describes, so that he does not give us his account of them as a mere, indifferent spectator, but as a man feeling for human rights and wrongs, as a judge passing sentence, with all due candor and equity, in accordance with the eternal principles of justice announced in God's word, upon the doings of all who pass in review before him: a great power of delineation, with bold outlines and masterly touches, and a happy talent for effective grouping, often of vividly dramatic arrangements and combinations of actors and actions, and a keenly piercing glance to detect the real character of these, however concealed or varnished by plausible pretensions and external seemings: add to all this an earnest manner of expression, a vigorous, manly, straightforward style, in which the immense mass of information, laboriously collected from all accessible, authentic sources, is copiously poured forth in a clear and majestic current, and we have everything that we can reasonably ask of the historian, who undertakes to instruct and interest us in respect of one of the darkest and yet, at the same time, brightest acts in the great historic drama of this world. In fact, the work is, as it could not fail to be, a complete success: while its reception here has been enthusiastic, the British critics are lavish in the bestowment of the highest encomiums, characterizing it as "history as complete as genius and industry can make it," and representing Mr. Motley as "far more careful in his researches, and more scrupulous in the selection of authorities than Mr. Macaulay:" &c. We have no doubt that not only judicious and discriminating criticism, but also the sound judgment and correct taste of the reading public generally, will at once place Mr. Motley in the foremost rank of historians.

We have said, that whilst our author is perfectly candid in his judgments, and fair in his representations, he is not merely a cold, unconcerned narrator of events, and we think that to demand of any historian that he should be so, is unreasonable. To us, indeed, the writer who relates to us the most startling and affecting destinies of nations and communities, and distinguished persons, and recounts the most thrilling incidents, and describes the most dreadful scenes, in the apathetic manner of a perfectly indifferent spectator, in the tone of one who is advertising an auction of second-hand furni-

ture, is quite intolerable. But Mr. Motley has thrown himself into the great work of writing this most important history, not only with all the necessary love of truth, and all the earnest and patient inquiry and sifting of evidence requisite to its ascertainment and just exhibition, but with all the purer and higher sympathies of humanity in constant and healthful action. He has made this grand section of modern history the study of his life, and he writes with all the decision, the clearness and the ample detail of one who has made himself thoroughly acquainted with his subject; but, at the same time, he shows upon every page, that he has not only weighed the character, conduct and career, both of Philip and all his minions, from Granvella and Alva down to the most brutal soldiers in the Spanish army, and of William of Orange and all his coadjutors and dependents, in the equal balance of justice, but that he has tested them by the great law of love, the great obligations of charity and kindness which every man owes his brother; and the result is his unqualified condemnation and utter detestation of the former, and his high admiration of Orange, and his deep sympathy with a nation subjected to cruelties and atrocities almost unparalleled in history. Entering with warm feelings of profound disgust into the exhibition of the Spanish treachery, bigotry and misrule, and of deep commiseration and lively fellow-feeling into the detailed account of the unexampled sufferings, continued during so many years, of the provinces, he sets before us a picture well fitted to provoke our intense indignation and aversion, and to call into action our deepest and most ardent sympathies. Those disposed to be hypercritical might cavil at the somewhat romance-like titles with which he designates the prominent scenes and transactions of this extraordinary narrative: but the truth is, that, in comparison with this awfully serious and most appallingly solemn history, the most romantic novel, abounding in the most thrilling incidents, and the most startling adventures, sinks into tameness and pales into insignificance.

Mr. Motley may truly be said to be the first HISTORIAN of this great event, the revolt of the United Netherlands from the Spanish crown; for Watson's *Life of Philip II* is more properly a history of Spain, in which the theme of these volumes finds its place among other important events of the same reign: Schiller's brilliant and philosophic work is not really a continuous historic narrative, but a succession of grand tableaux, accompanied with the author's ingenious and pro-

foundly interesting observations upon them. Neither of these two writers did or could make the extensive and profound researches of Mr. Motley, who not only devoted much more time and labor and careful investigation to his task, but most ably availed himself of materials which have only recently come to light, records, documents, and above all, correspondences of Philip and others, of the utmost importance and value. And the results of his inquiries, exhibited in these three large volumes, are full of warning and instruction to other nations, but especially to republics like ours, which, like that whose fearful struggles and awful sufferings are here described, consists of a number of confederated sovereign States. From this narrative we may learn, in the present fearful juncture in our affairs, what countless and immeasurable evils grow out of disunion. In the case of the Netherlands it was, in reality, only the absence of united action which made them the easy prey of a ruthless tyrant; Heaven alone can know into what calamities we should rush, were the insane and suicidal demonstrations which at present distract our country, to divide us into hostile hosts and plunge us into civil war.

But apart from the many political lessons to be learnt from this sad history, there is another which we can never cease to con and to turn to practical account, and that is, the true character of popery, which, according to its own boast, can never change, and therefore ever remains the same in the insatiable bloodthirstiness of its intolerant bigotry, in the ferocity of its ruthless fanaticism. And if ever our legislative assemblies should begin to lend a willing ear to the blandishments and seductive beguilements of that hideous heresy, that foulest and most persistent enemy of the prerogatives of human reason, of human rights and liberty, of the happiness of individual and social man, and of true religion, the recollection and thoughtful contemplation of the desolation and woe, the unutterable miseries which this infernal and hateful power brought upon the Netherlands, always rich in the luxuriant fruits of nature, and until that awful visitation, for a long time the most prosperous country on the globe, may serve to warn us of the fate which would await us, if we should be tempted to surrender ourselves to the tender mercies of this emanation from the bottomless pit.

It had been our intention to extend our observations much farther, and to present a variety of extracts from our author's pages; but we frankly acknowledge that, when we ought to

have been assiduously employed in writing our review, we were completely wrapped up in the perusal of the book, irresistibly carried away by the absorbing interest of the narrative. There is some comfort in knowing that others have fallen a prey to the same fascination, while we envy those upon whom the spell has not yet been riveted, seeing they still have an extraordinary pleasure in expectance. And now this, we trust, excusable delinquency, aided by a multiplicity of imperative engagements, has delayed the extended review which we had intended, to so late an hour, that we are obliged to conclude by earnestly recommending our readers to procure for themselves this truly great and admirable work, by the production of which the author has conferred no less honor upon his country, than he has won praise and fame for himself, and than which, we can assure them, they can find nothing more instructive or interesting within the compass of modern literature.

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, in Greek and English, with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. By Samuel H. Turner, D. D., Professor of Biblical Learning and Interpretation of Scripture in the General Theological Seminary, and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College, New York. New York: Dana & Co., 381 Broadway.—1856.

We are glad to see that Dr. Turner has added a commentary on this very important, and in some respects difficult, epistle, to his many other works either directly exegetical, or furnishing aids for the correct interpretation of Scripture. Among Biblical critics who write in the English language, he occupies a very distinguished rank. The Doctor is familiar with the works of the most eminent German theologians and commentators, and he makes good use of them, as his frequent references show. He cites them, sometimes, only to differ from them and to record his good reasons for rejecting their views. He is by no means a copyist who retails other men's opinions, and repeats, in an altered form, what others have said before him. All his works bear the strongest evidence

of his own profound erudition, and show that he investigates, thinks and decides for himself. Whilst there is no ostentatious parade of learning, its satisfactory results, exhibited on every page, afford the student constant evidence of its presence. Dr. Turner has none of the pedantry of the mere scholastic critic, who knows nothing but rules of syntax and the axioms that govern the routine of the professional rhetorician; but, whilst he duly honors and observes the established principles of criticism, he no less habitually exhibits the important qualities of candid but independent examination, great conscientiousness in endeavoring to give a correct interpretation of the written word, and good, sound common sense, which is not embarrassed by mere technicalities and quibbles. Although a loyal son of his own church, he does not carry its peculiar dogmas, or his own views and theories into the sacred text, or make its inspired words confirm any foregone conclusions of his own. While we differ entirely from some of his views, expressed in some of his other works, we regard him as rigidly honest and candid in his interpretations, and perfectly fair in his manner of dealing with passages about the meaning of which men differ and dispute. We know of no critic, whose works we would more readily recommend to students of the Scriptures; for, though we may not always agree with him, we know that he always gives what, after thorough study and profound reflection, and comparing scripture with scripture, he honestly regards as the true sense of the text, without torturing the words of the original, or treating with contempt those from whom he differs: to those, therefore, who will imitate his example, by inquiring and considering for themselves, he will ever be a safe guide. The work before us is among the most valuable recent contributions to Biblical criticism in our language, and as such we commend it to the attention and study of our readers.

Prophecy viewed in respect to its distinctive nature, its special function and proper interpretation. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Free Church College, Aberdeen. Author of "Typology of Scripture," "Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy," &c. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St. Philadelphia: Smith and English.

A sterling work, very much to our taste, of which we hope to be able to say more at a future time.

The Inquirer directed to the work of the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. Octavius Winslow, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston.

Several editions of this volume have appeared, and its character is such as to commend it favorably to the seeker for truth in regard to the operations of the Holy Ghost.

Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Depicted by Dr. C. Ullmann, the translation by the Rev. Robert Menzies. Vol. II. Philadelphia: Smith & English.

Having noticed volume first of this admirable work, we deem it unnecessary to add anything further in praise of it. It is of the highest value.

The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John, viewed in their mutual relation. With an exposition of the principal passages. By Carl August Auberlen, Dr. Phil., Licentiate and Professor Extraordinarius of Theology in Basil. Translated by the Rev. Adolph Saphio.—Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St. Philadelphia: Smith and English.

Subjects are brought to view and discussed in this volume with learning and moderation, of the highest interest. Without according our assent to all the contents of this volume, we can recommend it to the careful perusal of all who study the prophecies, and seek for additional light in regard to their import.

Internal History of German Protestantism since the middle of the last century. By Ch. Fred. Aug. Kahnis, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Leipzig. Translated from the German by the Rev. Theodore Meyer, Hebrew Tutor in the New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St. Philadelphia: Smith & English.

The course of Theology, during the period indicated, from a distinguished divine and professor. It will be welcomed by all who are interested in the history of the German church, whose developments have been so extraordinary.

Memoir of the Life and Times of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, D. D., Patriarch of the Evangelical Luth. Church in America. By M. L. Stoecker. Professor in Pennsylvania College. *Semper honos nomenque tum laudesque manebunt,* (For the Lutheran Board of Publication.) Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston.—1856.

The general favor with which this biography has met, is proof of its excellence. It is deserving of all the praise it has received, and will be eagerly read by thousands, not only of the present, but future generations. It is a memorial of one whose name will be illustrious in all suc-

ceeding time, in the Lutheran church of America. A faithful picture of a true man, an honored servant of God; it will serve to perpetuate a memory which will be undying.

Prepared by the same hand, which has done so much in bringing into notice and recovering the reminiscences of deceased worthies of our Lutheran ministry, with which the pages of our Review have so often been ornamented, it will, in due time, take its place in a volume which will be published, embracing the entire series.

Thoughts and Apothegms from the writings of Archbishop Whateley. Invenies etiam disjecti membra poetæ.—Horace. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston.

Thoughts of a thinker adapted to produce thought, and to lead to action sanctified by grace.

Prayers for Individuals and Families. Published by several Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio. Columbus.—1856.

A small but comprehensive volume, well gotten up, and adapted to Lutheran views. Constituting an addition creditable to its authors, to our devotional books, properly used it cannot fail to be useful.

Schaeffer and Koradi have furnished us with the first and second number of "Die bedeutendsten Kanzelreden der älteren lutherischen Kirche in Biographien und einer Auswahl ihrer Predigten dargestellt von William Beste." With this we are much pleased, and will notice it more fully.

The books from the house of T. A. Kurtz will receive notice in our October number. Too late for this: *Sermon on the Mount*, a *Journey to Rome and back again*, and *Dr. Schmucker's American Lutheranism vindicated*.

Harper's Magazine comes regularly, and sustains itself well. The series for children is increasing monthly—the *Engineer*, No. 19, and *Rambles among the Alps*, No. 20—both highly attractive, are in hand.